THE EXPOSITOR.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE EXPOSITOR.

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

REV. CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

REV. PROFESSOR PLUMPTRE, D.D.

REV. W. SANDAY, D.D.

REV. J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D.

REV. RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., B.Sc.

REV. PRINCIPAL TULLOCH, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR W. MILLIGAN, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A.

Rev. Professor Alex. Roberts, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

REV. JAMES MORISON, D.D.

REV. J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.

REV. PRINCIPAL A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR D. W. SIMON, Ph.D.

REV. PROFESSOR H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D.

PROFESSOR JOHN MASSIE, M.A.

REV. HENRY BURTON, M.A.

MR. R. W. DALE, M.A.

REV. P. THOMSON, M.A.

REV. JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

REV. S. A. TIPPLE.

REV. HENRY ALLON, D.D.

REV. ALEXANDER RALEIGH, D.D.

J. N. Robinson

THE

EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

SAMUEL COX.

VOLUME X.



HODDER & STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.
MDCCCLXXIX.

V. 10 1879:2

The Greshum Press:

THE EXPOSITOR.

THE RHETORIC OF ST. PAUL.

Josephus, in an interesting passage at the close of his Antiquities, after boasting with characteristic self-complacency of his unequalled attainments in all Jewish learning, adds that he had also taken great pains to acquire the learning of the Greeks, and a grammatical mastery of the Greek language. He admits, however, that long familiarity with his native Aramaic had prevented him from gaining an accurate pronunciation of Greek, and tells us, by way of excuse, that his nation generally discouraged the acquisition of many languages, or the attempt to adorn their discourses with smooth periods — accomplishments which they disdained to share with slaves and freedmen.

But the position of St. Paul was very different from that of Josephus. The astute Jewish politician had been trained from early childhood up to the age of twenty-six in Palestine, and mainly in Jerusalem; and it is evident from his silence that he had not, during that time, been a pupil of Gamaliel, the only Rabbi who was sufficiently liberal to encourage, or even to tolerate, "the wisdom of Javan." He therefore grew up in the very head-quarters of the Aramaic dialect; and

1 Josephus, Antiq. xx. 11, 2.

JULY, 1879.

VOL. X.

although Palestine was at that period sufficiently bilingual to furnish plenty of opportunities for learning Greek as a spoken language, it could never have been to Josephus quite so familiar as his native tongue. With St. Paul these conditions were reversed. By birth a Hebrew of the Hebrews, he was by training a Hellenist. He had grown up, certainly until boyhood, in one of the most famous of pagan cities, where he would only hear Aramaic in the synagogue, and perhaps sometimes in the family circle, but where he would hear Greek spoken on every side directly he stepped into the street. He must have learnt the language without any conscious labour, and almost as his mother-tongue. And when he went to Jerusalem, he became a member of the school of Gamaliel, which permitted the study of Greek authors, in order to unite —at least ideally—the tallith of Shem with the pallium of Japhet. St. Paul's Greek is less strictly accurate and more provincial than that of his famous contemporary, but it is incomparably more forcible, and probably it was used with far greater ease. And there was this further difference between their styles: that while St. Paul cared very much for what he had to say, he cared to a much lower degree than Josephus about the manner of saying it.1

The notion, so often repeated, that St. Paul was a classical scholar, profoundly versed in heathen authors, is, as I shall prove elsewhere, a complete delusion. His quotations from Menander, Aratus, and Epimenides, are mere stock quotations, of which the two first occur in more than one writer, and the third is a familiar national proverb. They do not furnish the smallest

¹ Cor. i. 17; ii. 4. οὐκ ἐν πειθοίς ἐνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις.

evidence of an advanced classic culture, the existence of which is decisively disproved both by the omission of all direct references in the Apostle's writings, even where we should naturally look for them, and by the total absence of any traceable impress left by the Greek authors on the most susceptible of intellects. It is, I think, certain that with the great masterpieces of ancient literature-with Homer, with Sophocles, with Plato, with Aristotle - Paul was absolutely unacquainted. There is, indeed, a close resemblance in form between him and one eminent Greek, the historian Thucydides; and a book was written in the last century, by Bauer, called Philologia Thucydideo-Paulina (1773), to shew how closely the two writers resembled each other in their syntaxis ornata, or "figures of speech." And yet no scholar has ever seriously maintained that St. Paul had read Thucydides. The narrative, so full of immortal interest to us, would probably have had little or no interest for a Jew, who, like all the rest of his nation, felt an almost entire indifference for secular history. The resemblances between the banished general and the hunted missionary are due to psychological causes. Both suffered from lifelong and virulent opposition; both stood in a relation of antagonism to the main current of feeling in their nation; both were men whose thoughts were of a nature to strain to the utmost the capacities of language; both, in the endeavour to obtain a direct grasp of conceptions in all their bearings, display "a love of antithesis and contrast, rising, not unfrequently, to paradox;" I both were accustomed to let the syllogism of grammar yield to the syllogism of emotion; both,

Esee some excellent remarks in Baur, Paulus, ii. 281 (Eng. trans.).

though capable of the most powerful eloquence, display a certain disdain for literary polish, because, while they cared much for ideas, they cared little for the form in which they were expressed. The resemblances would have been nearly as striking if they had written in two different languages. It is, no doubt, a curious psychological fact, illustrative alike of St. Paul's peculiarities and of his complex training, that "it is in the dialectical skill of Aristotle, the impassioned appeals of Demosthenes, the complicated sentences of Thucydides, far more than in the language of Moses or Solomon, or Isaiah, that the form and structure of his arguments finds its natural parallel;"—vet at the same time it is all but certain that with the writings of those philosophers, orators, and historians, he was very little or not at all acquainted.

But if Paul be so careless of style as these remarks would seem to imply, some may feel inclined to ask whether it is not a misnomer to talk of his rhetoric? Now as to this I would observe that it is only true to say that he is careless of style when by style we mean something polished and artificial. A style may be faulty, may be liable to a thousand criticisms, may be too rough or too ornate, or too indifferent to rhythm, or too neglectful of grammar, and yet may be incomparably the best style which a particular man could have used, because it sprang naturally from his character and education, and is therefore most exactly expressive of himself; - of himself as the complex total result of his original temperament, and of the modifications which it has undergone from the myriads of influences for which he has shewn the greatest affinity. The best style a man can have is "the style of his

thought." The style of Æschylus is turgid, that of Aristotle dry, that of Virgil elaborate; yet who would wish to alter a word or line that they have written? We should do wrong to make models of Milton's impassioned rhapsodies, or Sir Thomas Browne's quaint Latinisms, or Butler's emotionless aridity; but should we not have been the losers if they had written otherwise? Of modern writers, Macaulay is antithetic, Ruskin florid, Carlyle almost grotesque; yet we do not wish their style changed, because in each instance the style has "the defects of its qualities," and is most expressive of the individuality of those great writers. It is not true that Buffon said, "Le style c'est l'homme;" but it is true that he said, "Le style c'est de l'homme;" 1 and, as Grimm remarked about Montesquieu, it is "better to have the style of genius than to have the genius of style."

Now, if there had been reviewers in the days of St. Paul, they might have passed upon him censures without end. How careless are those unfinished sentences! What ungraceful and tedious repetitions of the same word again and again! What extraordinary confusions of metaphors! What a barbarous cilicism! What a vulgar expression! What an obscure sentence! What a violent paradox! What a bitter taunt! If some friendly Atticist or Tarsian professor had got hold of one of the Epistles, to prepare it for publication, he would have made great havoc of it. We should have had whole sentences underscored, and softened down, and squared, and elaborated; graceful variations of the same term; phrases suited to the politest society; all

² Since writing this sentence I find that "Le style c'est l'homme même" is found in the earliest editions of Buffon, though the de is inserted (perhaps by error) in the later ones.

provincialisms and irregularities removed. So the Epistles of St. Paul might have been made as correct as those of Philostratus; but although it would have been impossible to reduce them to the vapid inanity of the immoral pagan sophist, it would have been but too possible to rob them of their characteristic life. Paul's arguments would no longer have been thunders; he would no longer have spoken "mere flames;" his phrases would no longer have been half battles; his words would no longer have been "like living creatures, with hands and feet."

But it is a mistake to imagine that, under these circumstances, we cannot talk of the Apostle's rhetoric. That word is so ignorantly misused by writers who pour forth their judgments on all conceivable subjects, that it is now understood to be a condemnation to call a writer "rhetorical." By that expression it is meant to be understood that he is artificially elaborate, that he is insincerely eloquent, that he goes out of his way to find ornamentation, that he only cares for what is called fine writing. It has become a sort of reproach, which might be levelled equally at the μυροβρεχείς cicinni of Mæcenas and "the sevenfold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies" of Milton's prose. But what is rhetoric? It is nothing more or less than the art of expression; and that art may be inspired by genuine emotion, and come in the form of perfectly natural and spontaneous utterance. The style of a writer who is powerfully swayed by his feelings often seems to be modelled into conformity with certain artificial figures of speech, only because those very figures of speech-as is proved by their existing in all languages-are the immediate result of psychological in-

fluences. If rhetoric in general were my subject, it would be easy to shew that there is not a figure of speech which does not exist in the literature of every civilized language, whether Arvan or Semitic, and which is not found in the earliest recorded specimens of those literatures. I have in part shewn this in my Chapters on Language; and in the Brief Greek Syntax I have quoted numerous instances to shew that many of the figures of Greek rhetoricians were equally familiar to Hebrew prophets. But, setting figures of speech aside for the moment, a passage is rhetorical when it expresses what it has to express in such a manner as to bring it home with the utmost vigour to the mind of the hearer or reader. It is rhetorical when the thought owes something of its power of appeal to the form in which it is expressed no less than to its intrinsic force. In this sense St. Paul, like all the greatest writers in the world, is at times overwhelmingly rhetorical -rhetorical with the rhetoric of a deep emotion and an intense individuality.

Take, as a remarkable instance, the passage (Rom. ii. 17-23) on which I touched in a former paper, and which, following the correct reading, and bringing out the force of the words, may be rendered as follows:—
"But if thou bearest the proud name of Jew, and reposest on the law, and boastest in God, and dost recognize the Will, and discriminatest things transcendent, and art confident that thyself art a leader of blind men, a light of them in darkness, an instructor of fools, a teacher of babes, having a form of knowledge and of truth in the law—thou, then, that teachest another, dost thou not teach thyself? Preacher against theft, art thou a thief? Forbidder of adultery, art thou

an adulterer? Loather of idols, dost thou rob temples?" Now, it would have been perfectly easy to express every thought in this passage in an entirely unrhetorical manner. The rhetoric consists, first, in the consummate irony of the apparently respectful picture of a Pharisee in all the full-blown prestige of sanctimonious dignity—and then the aposiopesis by which the sentence is broken off, the hypothesis unfinished, the construction changed, and, with a most unexpected apostrophe, the interlocutor is suddenly overwhelmed with a series of crushing questions. The very splendour and force of the passage lie in that element which we should characterize, and rightly characterize, as powerfully rhetorical.

Take another celebrated passage—the sixth Chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. As he dictates that passage to his amanuensis, St. Paul seems to be struck with the spontaneous outburst of his own inspired eloquence, and pauses in the midst of it to say to the Corinthians, "Corinthians! our mouth has been opened to you, and our heart has been broadened," in order that he may found on this open-hearted passion of words the appeal: "Ye are not being straitened in us"—there is no compression, no limitation, in my love for you—"but ye are being straitened in your own feelings"-the coldness, the want of effusive sympathy, is with you. "I speak to you, then, as to children. Pay me back in kind: be ye, too, broadened in sympathy to me." But wherein consists the eloquence and rhetoric of the previous passage, in which he feels that he has poured out his very heart? St. Paul might have given, in the most specific and unrhetorical way, a catalogue of his persecutions and sufferings: but in this Chapter the power of his description of what a Christian missionary should be, lies almost entirely in its rhetorical features—in its copia verborum, in its balanced rhythm, its varied use of the same preposition (êr), its sudden change (Verse 7) to another preposition (ĉià), and then in the sudden outburst of striking antitheses:—

"As deceivers and true; as being ignored yet fully recognized; as dving, and behold we live! as being chastened, and not being slain; as grieving, yet ever rejoicing; as paupers, yet enriching many; as having (exoures) nothing, and having all things to the full (κατέχουτες)."—Here we have not only antithesis and striking paradox, and the picturesque working out of a conception (epexergasia), but also that equality of clauses and assimilation of endings which was known to Greek rhetoric as parisosis and paromoiosis, I and which would come all the more naturally to St. Paul from his familiarity with the antithetic parallelisms of Hebrew poetry. Not only in this Chapter, but throughout this impassioned latter section of the Epistle (which some have regarded as a separate letter), St. Paul is evidently in what is called a rhetorical mood, which is merely equivalent to saying that he is writing with deep emotion. And it is remarkable that the same features of style invariably appear when he is referring to that "Iliad of woes" his missionary life. In I Corinthians iv. 8-11 we find it mixed with a most biting irony. In 2 Corinthians xi. 26 the colour of the picture is heightened by the repetition of the words

⁷ Aristotle, *Rhet.* iii. 9, 9, of which 2 Cor. vi. affords abundant illustrations ε.ε., "As dying, and, behold, we live" (general antithesis, ἀντικειμένη); ὡς λυπούμενοι ἀεὶ εὲ χτίροντες, &c. (γανίνοιἐς οf periods); παιξενόμενοι και μη θανατούμενοι (γανοποίοsis of final syllables); to say nothing of the paronomasia of ἕχοντες and ατέχοντες.

"in perils" eight times in one verse, which, except for the purpose of rhetoric, is entirely needless, but was known to the ancient rhetoricians as epanaphora. It is a figure by no means infrequent in the writings of St. Paul. There is a fine instance of it in Philippians iv. 8: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are real, whatsoever things are venerable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovable, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." And again in Philippians ii. 1: "If then there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any participation of the Spirit, if any emotions and compassions, fulfil my joy." Another striking instance of this figure may be found in 2 Corinthians vii. 11: άλλὰ ἀπολογίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀλλὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ ἐπιπόθησιν, άλλὰ ζήλον, άλλὰ ἐκδίκησιν.

Ancient grammarians held it sufficient to divide all figures of speech into figures of language (figurae verborum, elocutionis, hégews) and figures of thought (sententiae, biavolas). Aquila, a grammarian of the age of the Antonines, follows Cicero and other ancient authorities when he draws this distinction between them, that figures of speech disappear if you alter the words or their order, whereas figures of thought remain unimpaired by such a process. I But this classification is obviously superficial and unsatisfactory, and the distinction is only one of the roughest kind. It is a somewhat better arrangement to distinguish figures as falling under the heads of—

I. Figures of colour, i.e., those which are due to the imagination, such as personification, simile, metaphor, allegory, metonymy, catachresis, &c.

¹ Cicero, De Orat. 3; Voss. Instt. Orat. v. 1; Glass, Philologia Sacra, p. 953.

- 2. Figures of form, whether due to passion or to conscious art, which range over an immense field from the natural expressions of emotion to the merest elegances of verbal ornament; from the animation of irony and aposiopesis to such mere variations of style as roughed, or of order, as hysteron proteron and chiasmus.
- 3. Figures depending mainly on the analogies of words, on unconscious association of ideas, on resemblances of sound, such as alliteration, parisosis, homeoteleuton, parechesis, paronomasia, and plays on names.

Now I do not at all intend to enter into an exhaustive discussion of the nature and origin of figures of speech, which would require a volume; or to furnish a complete and careful list of St. Paul's figures of speech, which would require more time than I can at present devote to the subject. But while I think it possible that the youthful Saul may have attended classes in the schools of Tarsus, in which he learnt the rudiments of Stoicism -an interesting question which I cannot now pursue—it seems to me not only possible, but extremely probable, that he had attended classes of Greek rhetoric, and gained a tincture of that then-prevalent training. That this was the case will, I think, hardly fail to be the inference of all who consider merely so much evidence as I shall furnish in this paper.

On figures of colour I shall not touch. The Dean of Chester has published a little book on the metaphors of St. Paul, which deals to a certain extent with that branch of the subject. I will merely mention, in passing, the obvious circumstance that nearly all St. Paul's metaphors are social, agonistic, or military; and that,

through all his Epistles, almost the only metaphor which he derives from natural objects is that of the grafting of the wild olive branch into the fruitful stock, which, singularly enough, is founded on a method of grafting either non-existent or extremely rare.

But coming to the second head, *figures of form*, the instances are not only numerous, but are as varied as are the currents of human passion. Of these I will

furnish a few specimens.

(1) Chiasmus is a name derived from the Greek letter Chi (χ), because in it words are arranged crosswise. It is extremely common in Latin. Thus in such a sentence as, " $Ratio\ consentit$, $oratio\ repugnat$," which would be the natural order of the words, a Latin writer, influenced partly by the parechesis, or resemblance of sounds, would be almost certain to write, as Cicero does—

Ratio consentit,

Repugnat oratio.¹

placing the two substantives last, and the two verbs in the middle, as in the sentence—

He hath filled the hungry with good things; The rich he hath sent empty away;

or in Milton's lines-

Reason'd high Of freedom and *foreknowledge*, will and *fate*, Fixed *fate*, free will, *foreknowledge* absolute.

There is a striking instance of this figure in the arrangement of the clauses in Romans ii. 6, 10, where the results of good and evil actions are stated twice over, but the glory and honour which shall follow

patient well-doing are put at the beginning and end, as though to leave the first and last, and therefore the strongest, impression, while the punishments of evildoing are put twice over in the interspace. Bengel has called frequent attention to the use of this figure, which is, however, more common in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in the Epistles of St. Paul. It will be found in nearly every instance that even such changes of order have their own significance. How far more forcible, for instance, than the English is the Greek of I Corinthians iii. 17: Εί τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῦ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός.

(2) Eurhemismis the employment of pleasant or harmless words for unpleasant things. It may arise from many different feelings. Among the Greeks it mainly originated in the dread of evil omens, which they carried to such an extent that cuphemein and favere linguis, which originally meant "to speak words of good omen," came to mean "to be silent," because if, during a sacrifice or any solemn event, any words were used at all, some ill-omened word might slip out among them, and vitiate the entire ceremony. Hence they called the Furies the "gentle ones;" they spoke of a prison as "a house;" of an executioner as "a public officer;" of dying as "something happening," &c. That "beautiful bright people," as Faber says,

Hesitated still
To offend the blessed presences
Which earth and ocean fill;
Their tongues, elsewhere so eloquent,
Stammer'd at words of ill.

Now, of this kind of euphemism there is naturally little or no trace in St. Paul, because he had none of the superstition in which it had its root; nor has he any of

that glozing hypokorisma, which puts a varnish upon deeds which men are not ashamed to do, but which their tongues hold it vile to name. To St. Paul death is death, infamy is infamy, and a lie a lie. But we do find in him the honourable euphemism which refrains from needlessly using coarse expressions. His language never wounds the most delicate sense of modesty. When duty requires, he can tear very rudely open the veil of Cotytto; yet when there is no such necessity, he not only adopts the most refined language, as in I Corinthians v. I, 2 (ἔχειν . . . ὁ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας) and 2 Corinthians vii. II (ἐν τῷ πράγματι), but even does so to an extent which, in some instances (e.g., in 1 Thess. iv. 6), entirely and happily obliterates for modern readers the dark and terrible sense which his words had for the early Greek Fathers, as well as for his pagan contemporaries. It would have been better for the Church had all her writers imitated herein his modest reserve and "chaste bashfulness" of language. It is often a duty and a necessity to speak of sin. It can be rarely right to speak of it with wounding and brutal plainness. Language fails of its purpose, warning loses its power, if it is easy to miss its real meaning; but language, in order to be intelligible, does not need to become vile and coarse.

(3) Analogous in some respects to euphemism is LITOTES. The word properly means "smoothness," but it is a technical expression for MEIOSIS, or "lessening." It consists of the intentional use of an expression much less strong than the one which is intended and required. It is, in fact, the suggestion of a strong notion by the employment of an over-weak form of speech. The mental correction supplied by the reader

comes with all the more force because of its artistic suppression by the writer. Thus, if in speaking of the cannibal tyrant of Egypt, Virgil calls him "the unfraised Busiris," the reader instantly supplies with more indignation the thought, "unpraised? nay, execrable." And when Pope writes—

Narcissa's nature, tolerably mild,
To make a wash would hardly stew a child;

he conveys more strongly by his litotes the intended impression of the cruel recklessness of womanly vanity. This is a figure which, by a Hebrew idiom, runs through the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament, as far as the use of the negative is concerned, as in οὐ εικαιωθήσεται πῶσα σὰρξ—"all flesh shall not be justified," for "no flesh shall be justified." But St. Paul makes deliberate use of it in such passages as I Corinthians xi. 22: "What am I to say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not;" Romans i. 28: "God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do the things which are not convenient;" Ephesians v. 4: "Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient;" I Corinthians v. 6: "The subject of your boasting is not good." In Philemon 18 he uses of the theft of Onesimus the euphemism of charity when he says, "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought;" and he again employs litotes when of this once untrustworthy fugitive he writes, "which in time past was to thee "-he will not write "injurious," but—"unprofitable."

(4) Proparattesis, or "previous deprecation," and protherapeia, which the Latins called captatio benevolentia, is the very common rhetorical method by which

a speaker or writer feels his way before making a difficult or offensive statement, or tries to conciliate beforehand the kindly feeling of his hearers or readers. We have very different instances of it in the false and fulsome flattery of Tertullus to Felix, compared with the perfectly true yet dignified and respectful address of Paul to this Procurator and afterwards to Agrippa. We have a marked instance of it in the solemn and pathetic attestation with which he prefaces the stern conclusion of the ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. We have specimens of it in the prefatory thanksgiving of every general Epistle, with the single exception of that to the Galatians. He had to speak to the Corinthians many bitter truths, yet he begins his letter even to the Corinthians with thanks to God for the gifts and graces which He had bestowed upon them.

- (5) Paraleipsis, or praeteritio (also called occupatio), is an ingenious method of saying something which the writer says he will pass over, but to which nevertheless he wishes to allude. We have marked instances of it in Philemon 19: "I will repay thee—not to say to thee that thou owest to me even thyself besides." I Thessalonians v. I: "Of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you." The same convenient form occurs in I Thessalonians iv. 9, and in 2 Corinthians ix. I.
- (6) Zeugma is a figure by which, often out of mere carelessness, one verb is attached to two nouns of which it only suits the meaning of one, but naturally suggests a verb which is suitable for the other. It is a rare figure in English and in modern languages, partly perhaps because it requires in the reader a quicker

Auct. ad Herenn. iv. 27.

apprehension than modern authors can rely on, and partly because the immense multiplication of modern literature has rendered it necessary that every sentence, so far as its form is concerned, should be comprehensible at a glance to readers whose time is limited. There is a figure akin to it called syllepsis, which. though often confounded with zeugma, is different from it. In syllepsis the same verb applies equally to two different nouns, but in a different sense. In English there is scarcely an instance of this which is not intentionally comic, as in Pope's remark about Prince Eugene, "This general is a great taker of snuff as well as of cities." Except occasionally in poetry, it always produces a comic effect, even when seriously intended, as when Lord Carlisle, in his Sieges of Vienna, said of Sobieski, that "he flung his powerful frame into the saddle, and his great soul into the cause." We are not surprised that there is no marked instance of syllepsis in the epistles of St. Paul, because it is for the most part a very technical and poetic figure. The nearest approach to it (I think) is in Galatians i. 10: "Am I now currying favour with $(\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega)$ men, or (conciliating) God?" But he has at least two striking examples of zeugma: one in I Corinthians iii. 2: Γάλα ύμᾶς ἐπότισα καὶ οὐ βρῶμα — " I gave you (to drink) milk, not meat;" the other in 1 Timothy iv. 3: κωλυύντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων literally, "hindering to marry" [commanding, understand κελευόντων out of κωλυόντων, "to abstain from meats." To these expressions there is a remarkable parallel in St. Chrysostom, who says: "This I say, not as hindering you from forming connections, but" (bidding you) " to do this with moderation.

(7) Oxymoron ("sharply-foolish") is the paradoxical juxtaposition of opposite words, and we should naturally expect instances of it in any writer whose thoughts are often clothed in antithetic forms. It is, in fact, antithesis of the strongest kind reduced to the briefest compass, and sometimes existing in a single word, like bittersweet, γλυκύπικρος, θρασύδειλος, &c. It is found in Hebrew in such phrases as "drunken, but not with wine," and is frequent both in our poets and prosewriters, as in Shakespeare's—

Dove-feather'd raven, fiend angelical; Beautiful tyrant, wolfish-ravening lamb;

or Spenser's-

Glad of such luck, the *luckless lucky* maid Did her content to please their feeble eyes;

or in Tennyson's-

His honour rooted in dishonour stood, And faith unfaithful kept him falsely true.

But it is specially prevalent in Greek and Latin, as in such well-known phrases as $\gamma \dot{a}\mu o\varsigma$, $\dot{a}\gamma a\mu o\varsigma$, impietate pia est, &c.; St. Paul's oxymoron, "Dying, and, behold, we live;" and, "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" ($\zeta \hat{\omega} \sigma a \tau \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$), is a favourite one. We have, for instance, such lines as—

τὶς οἰδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστι κατθανῖιν, τὸ κατθανῖιν δὲ ζῆν ; (Who knows if life be death, and death be life?)

which struck the ancients as so startling a paradox; and Dryden's—

The dead shall live, the living die, And music shall untune the sky.

The Apostle uses this figure in Romans i. 20: 7λ 1 2 Cor. vi. 9. 2 1 Tim. v. 6.

αόρατα αὐτοῦ . . . καθορᾶται—invisibilia cjus videntur— "His unseen things are clearly seen."

Romans xii. 11: τῆ σπουδῆ μὴ ὀκνηροὶ—" In haste, not sluzzish."

3 Thessalonians iv. 11: φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ήσυχάζειν—" To be ambitious to be quiet." (Comp. Acts v. 41, "They were deemed worthy to suffer shame.")

I Corinthians viii. 10: οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν—"Shall be built up into eating idolofferings:" "ruinous edification." (Comp. Tertullian's aedificari in ruinam, Praescr. 3.)

Romans i. 22: φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ εμωράνθησαν—" Alleging themselves to be wise, they were befooled." This phrase will remind the reader of the *insaniens sapientia* of Horace,—the term which he applied to his false philosophy.

In Ephesians vi. 15, as part of the panoply of war, we have the preparedness (ετοιμασία) of the gospel of peace.

2 Corinthians viii. 2: "Their deep poverty abounded to the wealth of their liberality. (Comp. the word πτω-χοπλούσιος.)

2 Corinthians vii. 10: (μετάνοιαν . . . ἀμεταμέλητον)
"Repentance not to be repented of." Here the oxymoron is stronger in the English than in the Greek.

We come now to the third division of figures. Some instances of oxymoron also fall under the head of Paronomasia (the Latin annominatio), a figure of which St. Paul is peculiarly fond. There are two kinds of paronomasia. One is a change of meaning in a word caused by the alteration of a single letter;

^{1 &}quot;Parva verbi immutatio in litterâ posita." Cicero, De Orat. ii. 63; Auct. ad Herenn, iv. 21; Quint. ix. 3, 66, &c.

the other is, more generally, a play upon words which have some kind of resemblance, either in sound only or also in meaning. The first class of paronomasias may be illustrated by Shelley's line—

And like a cloud dyed in the dying day;

the second, by Sheridan's correction of his remark about Gibbon: "Luminous, did I say? I meant voluminous." An instance of this kind is found in James i. 6: "He that wavereth is like a wave of the sea," where it does not occur in the original; and one of the former kind in the Prayer-book: "Among all the changes and chances of this mortal life." Both classes of paronomasia are found in St. Paul. Of the first we have no less than three instances in the first chapter of the Romans.

Romans i. 29: πορνέια, πονηρία, . . . φθόνου, φόνου. Romans i. 31: ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους. Again we find it in Romans xi. 17: τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν. And in Hebrews v. 8 we have the common instance, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν, which is found in the proverb παθήματα μαθήματα, nocumenta documenta.

(1) The other form of paronomasia, a play on words of similar sound, is perhaps the most frequent of all St. Paul's rhetorical figures. It often consists in the change of preposition in a compound verb, as in 2 Corinthians iii. 2: "Ye are our epistle, known and read (γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη) of all men." This particular play of words is found in the well-known

^{*} Alliteration (1 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 22; ix. 8, &c.) sometimes almost amounts to paronomasia. St. Paul is so fond of this figure, that it even leads him to the use of most unusual words, as $\pi εισμον η$, in Gal. v. 8. Comp. Rom. iii. 3; xvi. 2 ($\pi αραστῆτε$., . $\pi ροστάτις$); Ephes. i. 23; iii. 19; Gal. iv. 17; I Tim. i. 8.

story of Julian returning the New Testament to St. Basil, with the untranslatable paronomasia, 'Ανέγνων ἔγνων κατέγνων' to which the Saint replied, 'Ανέγνως οὐκ ἔγνως εἰ γαρ ἔγνως οὐκ αν κατέγνως ("You read it, but understood not; for, had you understood, you would not have condemned.") Compare Acts viii. 30.

Other instances are—

(2) Philippians iii. 2, 3: the famous contrast of genuine spiritual *circumcision* (περιτομή) and the mere physical mutilation of *concision* (κατατομή).

(3) Romans i. 28: "And as they refused (οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν) to have God in knowledge, God gave them up to
a refuse (ἀξόκιμον) mind." Here the force of the words
is remarkable. It shews that the punishment was in
kind: sin was the punishment of sin.

- (4) Romans ii. 1: "For wherein thou judgest (κρίνεις) another thou condemnest (κατακρίνεις) thyself." Similarly, in 1 Corinthians xi. 29–31, the play on the words "judgment," "discernment," "condemnation" (κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν), which derives such force from the paronomasia, is lost in the English. Not only do we miss the lesson that if discernment (διάκρισις) be neglected, the retribution comes as a judgment (κρίμα), which is intended only as a Divine education (παιδενόμεθα), but which, if ineffectual, leads to condemnation (κατάκριμα), but we also lose inevitably the force and beauty of the figure in the original Greek.
- (5) Romans xii. 3: "Not to be highminded (iπερφρονεῖν) above what he ought to be minded (φρονεῖν), but to be minded to be soberminded (σωφρονεῖν)." This elaborate paronomasia resembles the famous οὐ φρονήματι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρόνηματι of Thucydides ii. 62.

(6) 1 Corinthians vii. 31: "Using (χρώμενοι) this world,

as not using it to the full " (καταχρώμενοι). Compare supra on 2 Corinthians vi. 10 (ἔχοντες . . . κατέχοντες), and 2 Corinthians v. 4 (ἐκδύσασθαι . . . ἐπενδύσασθαι).

(7) 2 Corinthians iv. 8 : "Perplexed (ἀπορούμενοι), but not in despair" (ἐξαπορόυμενοι). Comp. 2 Corinthians

v. 4.

(8) 2 Timothy iii. 4: "Lovers of pleasure (φιλήδουοι)

more than lovers of God" (φιλόθεοι).

(9) 2 Thessalonians iii. II: "Not busy, but busy bodies" (μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους). This keen paronomasia, which St. Paul repeats in I Timothy v. I3 (οὐ μόνον δε ἀργαὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ . . . περίεργοι), "Busy in the female school of idleness," makes me think that St. Paul must have been familiar with the Latin proverb, strenua inertia, "busy idleness," and that he may even have heard the story of Domitius Afer, who described Mallius Sura¹ as one of a class who were non agentes, sed satagentes.

(10) 2 Corinthians x. 12: ἐγκρῖναι ἡ συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς
 κ.τ.λ. Here it is impossible in English to reproduce

the paronomasia.

It has been supposed by some writers that, since Paul probably thought in Syriac, there are traces of paronomasia in his thoughts where they do not appear in his Greek. Thus, in t Corinthians i. 23, 24, the words in Syriac might be: "We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block (micsol), and to the Greeks folly (mashcal); but to them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom (secel) of God." But conjectures of this kind are apt to degenerate into mere plays of the fancy.²

^z Quint. vi. 3, 54.

² See Glass, Philologia Sacra, p. 959.

The ancients of all nations were more fond than the moderns of what we should call plays, or puns, on names. We regard it as an instance of frigidity ($\psi v \chi \rho \delta \tau \eta s$) and bad taste. Macaulay rebukes the tendency to it in Southey, and classical commentators heap abuse on Æschylus for his fondness for these "cold etymologies." Nevertheless, we find them in even the most classic of modern writers, and Wordsworth does not hesitate to begin his poem to Charles Lamb with the lines—

From the most gentle creature nursed in fields Had been derived the name he bore.

Of this particular play of words there are, I think, clear traces in St. Paul. Pleading for Onesimus, he says, with an obvious reference to the meaning of his name "Profitable:" "Yea, brother, may I profit by thee (ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην) in the Lord" (Verse 20); as before he had said, "My son 'Profitable,' once to thee 'unprofitable,' but now 'profitable' to thee and to me" (Verse 11). It is true that here the words for "unprofitable" and "profitable" are not from the same root as Onesimus, probably because there was no such word as anonesimos in Greek. There is, indeed, anonetos; but on the one hand the paronomasia was all the more graceful for being a little softened down, and on the other it is not impossible that the words actually used (euchrestos, achrestos) may themselves involve another delicate play on words. It is well known that the ancients confused the name Christos, "anointed," a word which had purely Semitic connotations, with the common word chrestos, "excellent," and hence they spoke of the Christians as Chrestians. Now the Christians in no wise objected to this mispronunciation,

since it paid an involuntary compliment to their moral character, to which more than one of the ancient Fathers alludes. That the error began very early is clear from the fact that Suetonius attributes the expulsion of the Jews from Rome to their incessant tumults at the instigation of an agitator named Chrestus. Most historians have agreed that, since no person of that name is alluded to in contemporary history, the Romans, knowing nothing of the nature of Messianic disputes between Jews and Christians at Rome, in which the name Christus was often mentioned, imagined him to be some living person, whose name they misunderstood and mispronounced. If so, the error had already begun to be current in St. Paul's days, and he may mean to imply, not only that Onesimus is now "profitable," and no longer "unprofitable," but, further, that he is now no longer "Christless," but "a good Christian." It must be borne in mind that, in the prevailing itacism of that day, between achrestos and achristos there would be hardly an appreciable difference of pronunciation.

I see another such play on names in Philippians iv. 3. After beseeching two Philippian ladies—Euodias and Syntyche—to reconcile their differences, he adds: "And I beg thee also, true yokefellow, assist these women, seeing that they were fellow-wrestlers of mine in the gospel." In this passage the word Sygyge (Σύζυγε) has usually been understood as an ordinary noun, and has been supposed to apply to Clement, to Lydia, to St. Peter, and even (by Clement of Alexandria) to Paul's wife! I have very little doubt that it was a proper name—the name of Syzygus, a Philippian convert. If so, to call him "true Syzygus"—yokefellow by name and yokefellow

by nature—would be a genuinely Attic play of words, which might be paralleled by scores of passages in the Greek tragedians, and indeed in all poets, down to Shakespeare's

O Hero, what a hero hadst thou been!

or-

Thou, Leonatus, art the lion's whelp, The fit and apt construction of thy name.

The only objection to this view, which gives to the passage an appropriateness which it receives from no other interpretation, is that the name Syzygus—though a perfectly natural name—does not occur elsewhere. This, however, would by no means disprove the application of the passage. There must have been scores of names, especially in the provinces, of which no trace has come down to us, and Syzygus, as a proper name, would simply have to take its place with other hapax legomena, such as occur in every writer. Who would have doubted that there were "Politarchs" at Thessalonica, though not a single writer mentions them except St. Luke, and though the word only occurs in one single inscription?

St. Jerome thinks that he discovers a more latent instance of this kind of *annominatio* in Galatians i. 6, where he supposes that in the words, "ye are so soon being removed" (μετατίθεσθε), St. Paul refers to the resemblance of the name Galatae to the Hebrew Galal,

"to roll."

I might have adduced many other instances of Paul's figures of rhetoric, such as—

CLIMAX. Romans v. 3, 5; viii. 29, 30; x. 14, 15, &c. ANADIPLOSIS, or the forcible repetition of words. Romans ix. 30; Philippians ii. 8, &c.

Epanodos, or inverted repetition of words. Galatians ii. 16, &c.

Epanorthosis, or forcible correction of a weak or insufficient expression. Romans viii. 34; Galatians ii. 2, iii. 4, &c.

And to these might be added asyndeton (I Cor. xv. 43; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 3-5, 10, 11, &c.), polysyndeton, antiptosis (Col. iv. 17; Gal. vi. 1; iv. 11), synathroismos (Rom. i. 16-32; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 19, &c.), &c., but I spare the reader a multitude of these technical names, which might easily be added. This much, at any rate, is certain, that the figures of Greek Rhetoric occur in St. Paul far more frequently and in in a far more specific way than they do in the other writers of the New Testament. I think, then, that I have furnished some evidence in favour of the thesis with which I started - namely, that it is far from improbable that, as a boy in Tarsus, he had attended some elementary class of rhetoric, which, indeed, may have been only a part of his education in the grammatical knowledge of the Greek language. Tarsus was at this time a university town, in which there were many professional rhetoricians; and there was no branch of rhetoric to which, in the age of the emperors, more attention was paid than to the study and elucidation of rhetorical figures. They had commanded the attention alike of eminent philosophers and obscure grammarians. If St. Paul's parents intended from the

^{*}I do not reckon anakoluthon, or unfinished construction, among St. Paul's figures of speech, because his numerous anakolutha are accidental, not rhetorical. They are due to his eagerly pressing forward with his subject, as in Rom. xvi. 25-27; ii. 17-21; i. 8; I Cor. xi. 18; Col. i. 22, &c. The mere change into a participle or other construction is hardly to be accounted an anakoluthon, as in Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 16, &c. Perhaps the nearest approach to a rhetorical anakoluthon in St. Paul is Gal. ii. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 7.

first to send him to the school of Gamaliel, they would naturally be aware of the cosmopolitan liberality for which that school was celebrated. To some of the Rabbis—as we see from the Talmud—a knowledge of Greek learning opened a career of ambition; and the Pharisee of Tarsus, seeing the brilliant capacity of the youthful Saul, may have thought that an elementary training in Greek Rhetoric, for which the city of his home offered exceptional facilities, would be the best way of preparing his son for future distinction among the Hillelites of Jerusalem. If so, the lessons which he had learnt were not thrown away, though they were applied to very different objects than had at all been dreamt of by one who meant his boy to be like himself—a Pharisee of Pharisees, a Hebrew of Hebrews.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE SOLILOQUY OF JOB.

SECOND MONOLOGUE. (CHAPTER XXXI.)

And yet, radical and mournful as is the change in the whole tone and tenour of his life, it is utterly unprovoked. It springs solely from the change in God, who has withdrawn his presence from him and become "very cruel," although he has done nothing to

blunt his love, Or lose the good advantage of his grace, By seeming cold or careless of his will.

On the contrary, as he proceeds to shew in *Chapter* xxxi., he has made that Will the one rule both of his inward and of his outward life.

This Chapter is perhaps the most lovely in the whole Poem, and its theme is worthy of the exquisite

and flowing strain in which it is couched. Certain theologians bid us mark, indeed, that it is a purely natural, not a Christian, morality which Job claims to have attained, a morality therefore which could not render him acceptable to God; and certain critics have been shocked at the immodesty with which his claim is advanced, and all the virtues of his life laid bare to view. But if the morality of this Chapter be not that of the Sermon on the Mount, it would be hard to say where that morality is to be found. As he

Unlocks the treasures of his happy state,

Job represents himself as having been chaste, just, benevolent, pious: too magnanimous even to rejoice in the misfortunes of an enemy, much less to wish him evil; so hospitable, that his house stood open to all comers, and there was not a man in the tribe who had not been "sated with his viands;" so sincere, that he had no secret sin to hide, nor had ever failed to confess any sins of nature, defects of will, taints of blood, by which he had been inadvertently betrayed. He has been chaste in look and desire as well as in action; he has been just to his own hurt, not even wronging his neighbour by so much as a wish; he has not only refrained from wrongful gains, but even when enriched by lawful gains he has not put his trust in uncertain riches; he has not only shunned all forms of open idolatry, but he has not even suffered his heart to be secretly beguiled into any momentary compliance with the current superstitions of his age. And all this inward and spiritual morality—this morality of thought, desire, and emotion, as well as of outward and overt act—has been inspired by a spiritual motive, by a perpetual reference, and deference, to the will of Him who reads the thoughts and intents of the heart (See Verses 4, 6, 14, 15, 23, 28). The theologians who dub this a purely natural morality must surely have a far higher conception of "poor human nature" than they are wont to profess, and should at least point out in what respect it falls short of the morality taught by Christ; while, if they infer that it could not possibly render Job acceptable to God, it would seem that, like St. Peter, they need a special revelation from Heaven to convince them that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."

As for the immodesty which certain critics discover in these autobiographical reminiscences, it would be enough, perhaps, to remind them that Job is on his defence; that he had been openly accused of sins of injustice, inhospitality, impiety, greed; and that therefore he was bound to repel them by an appeal to the whole tenour and spirit of his life. But we may go further, and contend that to recognize "facts as they are," even though they be the facts of our own life, is not to o'ersten the modesty of nature. Nothing is more immodest than the sham modesty which hides self-esteem under a cloak of self-depreciation, and seeks to provoke our good word by speaking evil of itself. Even the Almighty, who is also the All-good, when He reviewed his works, saw, and said, that they were "very good." And even if Job had regarded his good works as his own, it would be hard to have blamed him for confessing that they were good. But so far from regarding them as his own, he constantly ascribes all that was good in them to his fear of God, who "beheld all his ways, and counted up all his

steps." The true and singular modesty of the man comes out in the fact that he can do that which would or might be immodest in us without thereby ceasing to be modest.

From a literary point of view the Chapter is so rich in felicitous strokes of art, and in charm of expression, that "none but itself can be its parallel." In many previous Chapters we have met with exquisite pictures elaborated with thoughtful care, but here we have a whole gallery of such pictures, which yet are bound together in unity by their common theme. The various aspects assumed by a just man's life under happy and sumptuous conditions are set forth with rare pictorial art, yet so as to reveal in each case the motives by which his several virtues are animated and inspired. It is the very wealth of beauty—and of that kind of beauty which must be felt, since it can hardly be analyzed and demonstrated—which makes it the despair of sympathetic Commentators. Shakespeare affirms-

Lean penury within that pen doth dwell That to its subject lends not some small glory;

but even his pen, which touched nothing that it did not adorn, might have faltered had he set it to reproduce and enhance the "glory" of these closing Verses in the Elegy of Job. Of course, nothing will be attempted here but a few brief notes, to indicate the sequence of thought, or to bring out a meaning which might escape the casual reader's cursory eye.

The first Section (*Verses* 1–8), though not destitute of pictorial power, is less marked by it than the subsequent sections of the Chapter: it is more various

in theme, more general in tone, and may fairly be regarded as mainly introductory—as the porch through which we are to enter the picture-gallery. Chastity and justice are perhaps the rarest virtues with all men: in all ages they have been conspicuously rare in the East, rarest of all in the rulers and magnates of the East. On these two virtues, therefore, as those in which men of his blood and station were most commonly deficient, Job places the burden of emphasis, claiming, in general terms, to have exercised them, even in these introductory Verses, expanding and illustrating the claim in Verses 9–23.

He had prescribed a law or entered into a covenant with his very eyes, forbidding them to soil virginal innocence with so much as an impure look (Verse 1). At the very outset, therefore, he strikes the key-note of his highest and most spiritual morality—that which rules thought and desire. He had anticipated the penetrating dictate of our Lord: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." And (Verse 2) this spiritual and high-toned morality was informed by the true motive. It was no fear of man, no dread of consequences, no respect for public order and well-being, no pure and stately self-respect even, which made and kept him pure; but simply reverence for the will and judgment of God, simply that "fear of the Lord" which he believed to be the highest Wisdom of man. "The eyes," says a Talmudic proverb, "are the procuresses of sin:" and Job believed (Verse 3) that had he but given license to his eyes he would have become "wicked," would have "done evil," and would therefore have been overtaken of misfortune and calamity.

For (Verse 4) the Divine Omniscience is not to be evaded any more than the Divine Power is to be resisted. He who beholds all our ways, however hidden and secret, has constituted Himself the Avenger of outraged innocence, the Judge and Chastiser of all who offend against his pure and holy law.

And his life has been as sincerely just as it was chaste. There has been no hypocrisy in it (Verse 5), no jar between principle and practice, but a plain yet studied sincerity, a clear and unimpeachable integrity. If (Verse 6) God will but weigh him in an even, or equal, balance, He will find—as indeed He had both found and declared—that Job is, if not a perfect man, at least "an upright." To God's judgment, therefore, he once more appeals, sure that He will know his integrity, though he does not so much as dream that God had boasted of his integrity in heaven long before he himself had begun to defend it on earth. If (Verses 7, 8) he has suffered his feet to be drawn from the straight path of obedience; if he has looked at his neighbour's lands to lust after them, and any stain of legal chicanery or violent extortion has stuck to his palm, he is content to take the due reward of his deeds, content that strangers should dispossess him of his lands, eating what he had sown, or destroying the harvest for which he had toiled.

In Verses 9–12 he expands the thought of Verse 1, and makes a picture of it. "A hot temper leaps o'er a cold decree." And he conceives of himself for a moment—though only to repel the conception with abhorrence—as having had his heart "ensnared," befooled, by a woman, a neighbour's wife, despite the covenant he had made with his eyes; and as playing

the part of an Eastern gallant-lying in wait at his neighbour's door for some signal or opportunity of secret access. An Arab poet, Muhâdi ibn-Muhammel. has a curious parallel to Verse 9, which shews that the manners and wiles of that primitive age have survived to more modern days. "The neighbour's dog never barked on my account," i.e., because I was lurking about on an illicit design; "and it never howled," i.c., because it was beaten for betraying, or lest it should betray, my presence. This sin Job disavows with vehemence. Lightly as men have commonly regarded it, to him it was an infamy that would be but justly avenged were he who is guilty of it himself to receive the very measure he had meted out to others. It was a public crime; it was a pernicious "fire," consuming him who kindled it, and burning down to the level from which it rose.

In *Verses* 13 23 the other sentiment of the Introduction is expanded, defined, illustrated; and Job depicts himself both in his private (*Verses* 13 15) and in his public (*Verses* 16 23) relations as governed by an exact and generous justice.

No servant of his, however absolutely at his mercy or command, had been willingly wronged by him, nor had any supposed wrong of groom or maid been contemptuously daffed aside. Even when they "strove" with him, and he, a judge, had been summoned by them before a bar of justice, he had treated them with respect. Even, so at least the Jewish commentators seem to have taught, when they strove with his wife, he openly espoused their cause if their cause were just; for we read in the Talmud: "The wife of Rabbi Jose began a dispute with her maid. Her

husband came up and asked her the cause; and when he saw that his wife was in the wrong, he told her so in the presence of the maid. 'Thou sayest I am wrong in my maid's presence!' cried the angry lady. 'I do but as 70b did,' replied the Rabbi." Neither by affection nor by self-interest, and still less by any despotic humour of the blood, would Job suffer himself to be diverted from the plain and beaten road of justice between man and man. And his motive was still the true motive—the fear of the Lord (Verse 14). His servants, his slaves even, were of one blood with him. Made by the same Divine hand, cast in the same mould, possessed of the same miraculous organs, senses, passions, with himself, they had the same claim and right to be weighed in an even balance—a right which he had never refused to admit.

In *Verses* 16–23 he passes from his private to his public relations, from client to magistrate, and affirms that, as a judge and ruler of men, he had observed the most exact and impartial justice, and that he had not forgotten that

earthly power doth then shew likest God's When mercy seasons justice.

So far from having abused the authority of his rank and station in order to take advantage of any man, however destitute or helpless he might be, it was precisely those who were most easily, and therefore most commonly, wronged to whom he had shewn the most studied and friendly consideration. This general assertion of his justice and benevolence he clothes in words so picturesque and suggestive that they call up before our minds a whole series of contrasted scenes. We see Job as he appeared in the angry and distorted

imagination of the Friends-holding back the poor man from his lawful and proper desire; suffering the widow's eye to languish for lack of comfort and help; eating his daily morsel in miserly and grudging seclusion, lest the hungry should cast on it so much as a longing look; standing by with an eye of indifference while the naked famished with cold; shaking a threatening fist at the orphan who came to plead his suit before the judges, the moment he (Job) knew the judges to be his friends: and, again, we see the man as he was and lived—training the orphan like a father; leading the widow along her perplexed and solitary path as if he were her child; tlinging the fleeces of his tlock round the loins of the naked, his own heart warming at the warmth of their gratitude, and singing with their song (Verses 16-21. Comp. Chap. xxix. 13 16). "If this," he concludes, "has not been the manner of my life from my youth up, if I have abused my pride and power of place, then let an exact retribution be meted out to my guilt. May my arm "-the symbol and instrument of his power—

"Struck by the impartial hand of injured Heaven,

fall from its socket and be broken at the joint" (Verse 22). He takes no credit for this imprecation; it involved him in no danger; the sin of injustice to the poor and helpless, common as it was, had been rendered impossible to him by "the fear of the Lord" (Verse 23).

In Verses 24, 25, while he hints at still another motive for his unstained integrity, he also advances another and a still higher claim on our respect. Men are commonly prompted to extortion and injustice by

greed. From that base prompting he has been saved by his indifference to wealth. Able to delight himself at all times in the Almighty, finding "the chief good and market of his time" in the service and favour of God, he has placed, he could place, no trust in uncertain riches. That "his hand had gotten much" quickened no emotion of pride or exultation in him; for to get much is not much to the man who has got God, and in Him treasures which no money can buy

(Chap. xxviii. 15-19).

Gold cannot be his God, nor can he have any God but the Lord. Even from the slightest and most momentary compliance with the prevailing superstition of his age and race he had kept himself free (Verses 26-28). Sabæism, or the worship of the celestial bodies, was the cult of the ancient Arab tribes. To throw a kiss with the hand toward the rising sun, or toward the moon, as she walked the clouds like a thing of life, was a recognized form of adoration, and seems to have been observed in secret long after the public worship of sun, moon, and stars had been forbidden and abandoned. To Job, such an adoration of the rulers of day and night, much as he admired their splendour and beauty-and that he was profoundly moved by them is evident from the terms in which he describes them (Verse 26)—was both a legal offence, "a crime for the judges," and a religious offence, "a denial of God above." Both the phrases just quoted from Verse 28 are striking and suggestive. The phrase "a crime for the judges" seems to indicate that the powerful clan of which Job was a sheikh had but recently embraced the din Ibrahim, as the Arabs still call it; that, like Abraham, they had resolved no longer to worship gods that set and change, and had made it a public offence to worship the creature instead of the Creator; but that the change was sufficiently recent to admit of many lapses into the old superstition, since the judges had still occasionally to punish it as a crime: while the phrase "I should have denied God above," though it may be meant simply to imply that God was "above" the sun and the moon, can hardly fail to recall the Divine Name so frequent on Arab lips—"the Exalted One," He who sits high above the generations of men and all the changes of time.

The rare and pure magnanimity depicted in *Verses* 29 and 30 lifts Job to a still higher pinnacle of moral greatness, a pinnacle on which the noblest of our race have found it hard to maintain their footing. "Love your enemies" is a Christian precept very indifferently observed even in Christendom itself. It was not a heathen who spoke of the pleasure most men take in the misfortunes of their friends. But with quiet and obvious sincerity Job affirms that he took no pleasure in the misfortunes of his enemies; that he neither wished them evil, nor exulted when evil found them out. Tried even by the Christian standard, the man who exults neither in his own prosperity (Verse 26), nor in the adversity of his enemy (Verse 29), must surely take high rank in the kingdom of heaven.

To us, perhaps, the hospitality described in Verses 31 and 32 may seem a far inferior grace to those which Job has already claimed. But to the men of his own day it must have been an impressive and speaking fact that, "instead of shutting himself up in an inaccessible fortress, like most Eastern nobles in unsettled districts," the fields of which lay open to the raids of

roving clans, Job's "door gave on the street," on the road, and stood open to all comers; that his hospitality was so lavish and unbounded, as that "the men of his tent"—i.e., the members of his vast household—could proudly demand, "Who is there that he has not sumptuously entertained?" This virtue of hospitality—a virtue that needed to be enjoined even on the bishops of the early Church—has come down to the Arabs of our own day, among whom "to open a guest-chamber" is a common synonym for setting up a house of their own.

In Verses 33, 34, Job claims a plain and perfect sincerity. Though "the general stream of his life," its whole manner and course, give so good a proclamation of him, may he not have been guilty of secret sins which, had they been known, would have stained all his virtues, and marked him for "a spotted and inconstant man"? Canon Cook holds that in Verse 33 we have a clear and "explicit admission that he was not free from sin which, had it been concealed, would have been iniquity, but, laid bare by honest confession, lost that character, and deserved pardon." But is that so? I doubt whether Job admits, whether he does not rather deny, that the outward beauty of his life had been blotted by sins at variance with its obvious tenour. It is quite true, as we have more than once seen, that he nowhere claims an absolute sinlessness, that his largest assertions of innocence leave room for errors without which he would have been more than man. And it may be that he both admits evil intents, and pleads that, when unlawful impulse awoke within him.

> His act did not o'ertake his bad intent, And must be buried but as an intent That perish'd by the way;

or that, when his intent was overtaken by his act, he had purged himself from guilt by frankly confessing it. But throughout this Chapter he has laid such emphasis on his purity of intention and motive, as well as on that of his actions, as to render it improbable that he should close it with an acknowledgment whether of secret or of open guilt. It is better, it is more in harmony with the present mood and tone of his mind, to understand him as repudiating the charge of covert and hidden sin; as reiterating the assurance that he "knows nothing against himself" to account for his loss of the Divine goodwill; as pleading that

his true eyes had never practised how To cloak offences with a cunning brow.

But if the general tenour of these Verses is disputed, so also is the rendering of the first line of *Verse* 33. Many, perhaps most, of the best Commentators read it,

If, like Adam, I have covered my sin,-

a reading for which I must give my vote, though I have not ventured to put it into the text. In the Hebrew, ádám stands both for man in general and for the father of us all, so that the "like âdâm" of this Verse is susceptible of either rendering. Some legend of Paradise, moreover, and of the sin that lost us Paradise, may be found in the traditions of almost every race. All the world over, Adam, hiding himself from the Voice of the Lord among the trees of the Garden, stands as the type of man who sins, and seeks to hide his sin from "the eye of offended Heaven." Very probably, therefore, Job here compares, or rather contrasts, himself with the sinful father of the race, and affirms that he has not sought to cloak or dissemble his

sin before Almighty God, to confine the knowledge of it to his own "bosom;" nay, that he has no such fatal and inward-eating transgression to conceal. Had he had any such sin to hide, he would have gone in constant dread of detection and exposure; he would have been afraid to take part in the public assemblies held in the Gate or on the *mezbele*; he would have feared, first and most of all, the "families" of his own tribe, since these were the most likely to detect his iniquity. Instead of publicly challenging inquiry, and maintaining his integrity, as he had done from the very moment he "opened his mouth," he would have sat silent and ashamed in the dark seclusion of his tent.

And now (*Verscs* 35-37) he suddenly breaks in upon the sequent flow of picturesque phrases, in which he has been delineating the happy days that are no more, to repeat his challenge. With the keen intensity of highly-wrought passion, he once more, and for the last time, appeals to God for a fair and open trial; and once more, and for the last time, he proclaims his integrity to Heaven.

Many translators sacrifice the effect of this abrupt exclamation by completing the sentence of the previous Verse thus: "Then had I kept silence, and not gone out of my door." But to leave the sentence incomplete, as though, choked by the rush of rising emotion, Job could not pause to carry it to an orderly close, comes nearer, I think, to the intention of the Poet, and is surely far more impressive. Indeed, few strokes, whether of nature or of art, could be more impressive than that, when our minds have been held in long suspense as one picturesque clause succeeds to another,

till we long for the words that shall end the suspense, instead of being soothed by some felicitous close, our attention should be roused and stimulated afresh by an outburst of eager passionate appeal.

It is the old touch, too, to which Job responds so eagerly and passionately. Again and again, during his controversy with the Friends, they had pierced him to the quick by alleging, or assuming, secret sins in him, at variance with the known and godly tenour of his life, as the cause of all his woes. Again and again we have seen him goaded to wild resentment and frenzied assaults on the justice of God and man by this very charge. And now, though their voices are mute, it is the same intolerable thought which agitates him once more. It is while he is asserting his clear sincerity, while he is repudiating the mere thought of some occult guilt, some bosom sin, that he breaks into his last appeal to the omniscient and almighty Judge.

The appeal, as was natural, takes a legal form, and by its very form suggests an age of advanced, yet imperfect civilization, such, for example, as existing monuments prove to have obtained in Egypt before the earliest date to which Job has been assigned. An age possessed of courts of justice, in which a written accusation and a written defence were demanded, must have been far removed from the barbarity, the rude and informal administration of the primitive races; while yet an age in which grave legal documents were authenticated by a sign, or mark, instead of a written name, must obviously have been lacking in general culture and education; and the phrase I have translated, "Here is my signature," means, literally, "Here is my signature, Ewald translates it.

Many an Arab chieftain could do no more at this day, however, than affix his mark; a hundred years ago it may be doubted whether more than one Englishman in ten, or more than one English squire in ten, could have done more; while three or four centuries ago most even of our great barons could but have drawn their "cross" or affixed their seal: and yet even then there had long been much and high culture among us, and an elaborate system of jurisprudence.

But who is the "Adversary" whom Job cites before the Divine Judge? The hypothesis that the Friends collectively are to be taken as the Adversary, and that their speeches reduced to writing contain the counts of his "indictment," while the Soliloguy of Job, which he is about to authenticate with his signature or mark, is the defence on which he relies, is not only too tame to be admitted for a moment, it is contrary to the whole tone and spirit of the Poem, and even to the plain meaning of this exclamation itself; since Job is here ejaculating a wish, and a wish he scarcely expects to be gratified, that his Adversary would prepare a formal indictment against him. What he feels most keenly is —for the extravagant misrepresentations of the Friends have long since been refuted—that he has no definite and plausible charge to meet, that he cannot discover what it is for which he is being smitten with stroke on stroke.

Nor can we for a moment entertain the hypothesis that at this point Job becomes dimly aware of the dark figure which stands behind the Friends, prompting their hard thoughts of him, as it had before stood beside the throne of God, moving *Him* against Job without cause; for this hypothesis is still more con-

trary to the whole spirit of the Poem, in which Job is throughout in utter ignorance of the Accuser who secretly instigates God and man against him.

It is difficult to see how any thoughtful student of the Book should feel in need of hypotheses so forced and unnatural as these. If there is one fact that stands out more clearly in the Poem than another, it is that, to Job's apprehension at least. God Himself, so long his friend, and in some mysterious way still his friend, has turned to be his enemy. It is God of whom he is in quest, whose voice he craves to hear, whose indictment he yearns to see, against whom, yet also from whom, he demands justice. His very Judge is also his Adversary; and yet he has no fear, for his Judge is also his Witness (Comp. Chap. xvi. 18-21), and his Adversary his Friend. We have studied the Poem to little purpose if we have not learned from it that these seeming contradictions in the relation of God toward him were all felt by Job, felt to be true, however contradictory; nay, that they were true, difficult as it may be to reduce them to a logical and coherent statement. And, therefore, we need not go in quest of the Adversary. Not only does Job twice expressly call God his Foe (Chaps. ix. 15; xvi. 9), but throughout his long weary trial he is seeking for a God he cannot find, who of set purpose evades his search (Comp. Chap. xxiii. 3-9).

God, then, is the Adversary whom Job still yearns to meet; the cause of whose anger he must ascertain before he can hope for peace; whose very indictment of him, if only he could obtain it, he would parade as an ornament and distinction; to be "near" whom is his one supreme desire, even though He should still

be his Enemy as well as his Judge. He has nothing to hide from Him; he longs to lay bare his soul to Him, to tell Him the very number of his steps. On whatever terms it may be granted, all he craves for is fellowship, intercourse, with the God he has loved, and loves, so well.

The closing Verses of the Chapter (Verses 38-40) have much exercised the critics. Even the most sober of them are sure that these Verses have fallen out of their true place, though they can produce no MSS. evidence in favour of their conclusion, and propose to insert them after Verse 8, or Verse 12, or Verse 23. And it must be admitted that there is much to suggest this conclusion, and I, for one, was quite prepared to accept it. Viewed merely as a work of art, it might have been better had the Chapter closed with the impassioned and sublime apostrophe of Verses 35-37-And yet, would it have been better? Is there not, after all, something artificial rather than artistic in the rhetoric of climaxes? Many a fine orator, carried out of and above himself by a passing wave of excitement or enthusiasm, hesitates—and I think wisely hesitates -to close with words so much above his usual level, and lets both himself and his audience gently down to earth again with a few final sentences pitched in a lower key. And not a few of the difficulties which the critics have discovered in the structure of this Poem spring from the fact that they judge it by inappropriate and even inadequate canons of art. Even a modern and Western poet might have scrupled to bring "the pleas of Job" to an end with a highpitched exclamation or apostrophe. And even if he

had preferred to close with a passionate climax, does it follow that an Eastern poet of an antique age should be tried by his conception of an artistic close? Surely it would be but wise and modest of us, before we undertake to recast the Chapter, to study the style and manner of the Poet we are seeking to interpret; to ask whether or not the passage as it stands is not in accord with his canons and his practice of art; and even to shew a little deference for a man so much more highly gifted than ourselves. And when once we raise the question, I am persuaded we shall leave the Chapter alone. Climaxes are not in his manner. As a rule, when he is swept up into his highest moods, he does not break off while he still hangs high in the heaven of thought and emotion, but, like the lark, sings on till he nears the ground. In this respect Chapter xix. affords a curiously close and instructive parallel to Chapter xxxi. There, as here, Job rises into his most impassioned mood, touching his highest point as he cuts his immortal Inscription on the Rock (Verses 23 27); yet even in the last Verse of the Inscription itself he lapses into a calmer tone, while in the two Verses that follow he comes down to the plain and takes up his controversy with the Friends in a still lower and more colloquial key. It may very well be, therefore, that it was the intention of the Poet not to close Chapter xxxi. with Job's sublime appeal to his Judge, but to shade it off and tone it down by letting him resume that description of his past felicity out of which he had suddenly soared up in his cry for justice.

These closing Verses are, as on this hypothesis we might expect they would be, singularly melodious and tranquil in their tone, as if, now that the pent-in passion had found vent, Job could look with a calmer and more pensive eye on the happy days that were gone. In a fine pathetic figure he denies that his land had any reason to disown him, to cry out against him as against one who had possessed himself of it by violence or fraud, or to weep as though it mourned for its rightful but dispossessed lord. If he had eaten the fruit of fields which he had not duly purchased, or to obtain which he had caused the rightful owner to breathe out his life, he prays that instead of wheat the thistle may spring up in them,

and all the idle weeds That grow in our sustaining corn.

At this point Job ceases to plead with God, as at the close of Chapter xxvi. he had ceased to argue with the Friends. We shall not hear his voice again till he hears the Voice he had so long yearned to hear. And before we part with him it is obvious to remark that, in this long agony and strife with the Power of Darkness, the victory is clearly with Job. Satan had engaged that, if only he were allowed to "touch all that he had," even to "his bone and his flesh," Job would renounce God and die. He had touched, and blighted, both him and all he had. And yet, so far from renouncing God, Job draws near to Him, cleaves to Him with an inalienable affection and trust, and can conceive of no honour or delight comparable with being admitted to his presence, even though it be to receive his sentence from the lips of his Judge. It is the very triumph of disinterested piety and de-

Ewald has a good rendering of Verse 38—

"Wenn über mich mein Acker schreit,

Und sämmtlich seine Furchen weinen."

voted love. Painful and mysteriously unjust as is the doom that hangs over him, vast and heartshaking as is the change in all his outward conditions, his heart knows no change; his fidelity never wavers, or wavers only as the magnetic needle which, though it tremble, points steadfastly to the Pole.

But if the description Job gives of himself in this Second Monologue be true—and by their silence they seem to consent to it; if this was what Job was really like, what are we to think of the Friends who have so "misquoted" him to us? how are we to forgive them for the cruel libels they have "stained him with"? If we would do them justice, we must remember how strangely the judgment of good men may be warped by theological prepossessions. Holding, as they sincerely held, that accidents were judgments, that suffering was an infallible proof of sin, their theory compelled them to assume that so great a sufferer as Job must be a great sinner, however successfully he had hid his wickedness in his own bosom. My friend Mr. Spurgeon, than whom it would be hard to find a man more sincere and devout, affirms 1 that he constantly meets in THE EXPOSITOR with "a secret unbelief" which he dreads "more than open infidelity." And why does he bring this singular and incredible charge against so many of the best men in every section of the holy catholic Church? Simply because most of the gentlemen who write in this Magazine dissent from the narrow and unscriptural dogma of Inspiration which

^{*} I only saw the Sword and Trowel for February, in which this criticism, or aspersion rather, occurs, towards the end of March, when this Lecture was being written. The illustration may as well stand, though by this time it is somewhat out of date; and though, alas, it would be by no means difficult to find more recent illustrations of the same narrow spirit.

he maintains. Simply because they hold that the Spirit of all Wisdom was poured out in fuller measure—without all measure indeed—on Christ than on the prophets who preceded Him. Simply because they hold that the Son of God both knew and taught more of God than any of the servants in his Father's house; and that the New Testament is better than the Old, and contains a larger and clearer revelation of the Divine Will. And with this "modern instance" before us, we need not be surprised to find that Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, misled by their narrow dogma, discovered a secret immorality in the pure and noble life of the Man of Uz, which was more to be dreaded than the open and glaring immorality of which they themselves were guilty in bearing false witness against him.

S. COX.

A WORD STUDY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. PART III.

THE partial revelation, then, to the Hebrews, of Jehovah, and of his law, had already raised their notion of "well-being" to a higher, yet more attainable, level. It cannot of course be safely affirmed that the belief in immortality was much less conjectural in the Old Testament than in the *Phædo*; but it was less vague in proportion as the knowledge of God was more definite. Again, it may be said that the Hebrew was depressed by a consciousness of sin and of consequent disunion with God, a sense of awe and law and moral remoteness, to which the heathen, with his more human

¹ Beyond the external and the intellectual, to the spiritual. See Part ii. of this Article, in The Expositor for June.

or more abstract conception of God, was a stranger. and which, for the most part, gave to Hebrew piety an air of distance and servitude; persons and things, the sinner and his sin, not having as yet been clearly separated. But surely it was a gain, a step forward, that the facts of sin and separation were faced. It may be urged, moreover, that while there is less egoism and self-concentration in the Hebrew conception of happiness than in that of Greek philosophy, there is still a national narrowness which at least equals the Hellenic isolation, and is more exclusive than the Stoic conception of the "one fold." But the Hebrew idea of the community of the higher life as the "kingdom of God," with righteousness-his will-as its basis, a distinct personality as its head, and in the end "all the earth" I as its extent, contained in itself a germ of unity which was fitted to be infinitely more living and fruitful than the Stoic's mechanical uniformity. And this was the root of the matter: the Hebrews had grasped with sufficient definiteness the notion of a personal relation with an almighty, all-holy, all-merciful God, which opened up to them a boundless region of happiness far beyond the cold resignation of the Stoics, the mental luxury of Plato's contemplation, or the self-seeking of the utilitarian Epicurus. And faith and love were already breaking off the husk of personal and national "prosperity" and "outward commandment;" for faith and love knew no partition walls, and "against such there was no law." 2

The development of faith and love, and, with them, hope, is that which gives fresh width and depth to the μακάριος of the New Testament. Faith and love come

¹ Dan. ii. 39.

² Gal. v. 23,

by revelation, and revelation was the keynote of the new dispensation, just as commandment had been of the old. Christ came to reveal what God was, and what man ought to be and could become. He took away the sense of insuperable distance by being "God manifest in the flesh;" the sense of inherent opposition between the Divine and human, by shewing how man was intended, after his pattern, to reveal the Godlike; the sense of the tyranny of evil, by redeeming men , from the consequences and dominion of sin, by exhibiting God as the active element in the work of moral renovation, by changing the consciousness of God from an outward influence to an internal reality; and thus, planting a new Divine life in man, He transformed the external enactment into the inner law of "faith working by love," and made his followers "no longer servants but friends." The seeming freedom of heathenism, the servitude to law of the Hebrew, were now both combined by love into a "law of liberty." He broke down the particularism of Israel by setting forth the worldwide love of God, his pity for them that feared Him and for them that feared Him not, and the universality of his kingdom; and He crushed all self-concentration, material, intellectual, moral, or spiritual, by proclaiming the brotherhood of man. He delivered the future from uncertainty by bringing "life and immortality to light," and by shadowing forth, though only in reserved symbol and metaphor, the nature of the everlasting glory. What inspiration for faith and love! What "fields and pastures new" for happiness!

And the usage of μακάριος in the New Testament runs parallel with the new revelation. Only in one or two passages does the word fail to carry a distinctly

spiritual meaning. In Acts xxvi. 2, Paul says, "I think myself happy, King Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee;" but the spiritual background—Paul's blessedness in being permitted to sow the gospel seed in the ground partially prepared by lewish culture—must surely not be lost to view. When in Luke xi. 27, it is recorded that "a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked," her thought was, in all probability, not specially spiritual; but Christ at once transfers the word "blessed" to the true region: "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." As might be expected, however, the universal sense of the word is unmistakably spiritual. Of this fact a few proofs will suffice.

In Luke x. 22, 23, Christ pronounces those blessed who have seen the revelation of the Father in the Son. "All things are" (or rather, "have been") "delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will" (that is, "wills to") "reveal him. And he turned him unto his disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see." And in John xx. 29, He assigns even a higher blessedness to those whose faith came not in consequence of sight.

In the Sermon on the Mount—the locus classicus of μακάριος in the New Testament—blessedness is attributed to those who exhibit the Godlike in their conduct; to the merciful—the pure in heart—and the peacemakers. In the promise that the "pure in heart shall see God," the personal relation with God which

Christ's revelation transfigured, left the pure Platonic contemplation, and even the Old Testament beatific vision, immeasurably behind. The "sonship" assured to the peacemakers, because they, like God, break down the walls between God and man, and man and his fellow, infinitely surpasses the heathen deification of man or humanization of God, and even the most rapturous conceptions of Hebrew piety. The blessedness of the "poor in spirit" diametrically opposes that of the heathen μεγαλοψυχία ("high mindedness"), and inculcates the happiness of unreserved dependence on God's renewing power, specially for spiritual supply. The beatitude, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled," pictures the perfect satisfaction to be found in that love of righteousness which is the "law of liberty," and which made it Christ's "meat and drink" to do the Father's will. "Blessed are they that mourn," is opposed to the Stoic grieflessness, to philosophy's contempt for emotion generally, and particularly to the heathen lack of penitence for sin; and teaches that Christian blessedness coexists with, nay, even implies, sorrow for personal failing and for the failings of our fellows, and a yearning for the "consolation" of that time when imperfection shall have passed away. "Blessed are the meek," goes beyond Aristotle's "meekness" (ταπεινότης) towards the gods, and his πραότης ("resentment under control"), and also beyond the Old Testament hatred of wicked enemies; counting happy that quietness and confidence which spring from a sense of God's wisdom, power, and goodness, and which engender a spirit of loving submission to his will, and of readiness to bear hardship or incur obligation at the hands of his crea-

tures. Finally, the assurance of blessedness in persecution transcends—once more by means of the personal relation (" for my sake")—the ordinary Old Testament conception of the drift of suffering, and the Platonic idea of the final advantage of trouble to the just man. In the exalted strains of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah we have the prophecy, and in the immediately succeeding verses of the Sermon on the Mount we have the explanation, of our Saviour's meaning, at any rate in part. The blessedness of persecution and of tribulation generally consists, first of all, in that growth of our capacity for serving others which will ensue if only faith and love guide us in our endurance. Christ seems to say: "All manner of trouble borne in faith and love towards me, will fit you for more perfectly fulfilling your function as the salt of the earth and the light of the world." Let us listen to the comments of the Apostle Paul: "We glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience "(or, "endurance"); "and patience, experience" (or, "approval"); "and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts." And again, in comparison with this, the comment in Colossians i. 24, "Now I] rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church: whereof I was made a minister." And again, 2 Corinthians iv. 8-12: "We are troubled on every side. . . . Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. . . . So then death worketh in us, but life in you." For this "joy set before him" 2-the joy of accomplished redeeming ser-

¹ Rom. v. 3-5.

² Heb. xii. 2.

vice—Christ Himself endured the cross, despising the shame; and "great shall be the reward in heaven" of those who, "for his sake," that is, in faith and love towards Him, fill up that which is behind of his afflictions, with a like service in view: for they shall "enter into the joy of their Lord;" they shall share in the satisfaction of a love which has gathered in the world.

For love was the beginning, and love shall be the end. The Old Testament injunction, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," has found its fulfilment in the inspiration of the New: "We love him because he first loved us." His love has begotten ours, and love is the perfection of "personal relation" with God. "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." 2 From this proceed "the work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in [union with] our Lord Jesus Christ." 3 Μακάριος is used once, though far more than once by implication, in reference to the law of love. In the Epistle of James 4 we read: "Whoso looketh" (or, "hath looked") "into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein" (or, "hath continued looking"), "being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." And none can read I Corinthians xiii. without inferring that, though μακάpuos is not there in the letter, it is throughout in the Apostle's mind to say: "Blessed, not so much he that believes, or he that works, or he that knows, or he that hopes, as he that loves." For love, and not δικαιοσύνη (whether the "righteousness" of the Old Testa-

¹ I John iv. 19.

³ I Thess. i. 3.

² Ibid. iv. 16.

⁴ James i. 25.

ment, or the "justice" of the ancient philosophers), is "the bond of perfectness" (τελειότης), is "the fulfilling of the law." This blessedness of love, for the individual, is the fulfillment of Aristotle's collective definition of happiness — ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετήν, οr κατὰ λόγον, ἐν βίω τελείω—"the rational virtuous activity" (or, "των κίνης") "of the soul in a life fully provided;" for such activity, as the New Testament teaches us, is πίςτις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη—"faith των κίνης by love." The original source of that ἐνέργεια ("working") is pointed out to us in Philippians ii. 13: "For it is God that των κέτη (ὁ ἐνεργῶν) in you." The condition of the "working" is that love, inspired by Christ's redemption, which makes Aristotle's joy in the good, and the Christian's joy in God, attainable by man.

But the preliminary definition of Aristotle, that "happiness results from the performance by man of the peculiar work which belongs to him as man" (τὸ ἐαυτοῦ έργον), reminds us of a fulfilment in blessedness beyond the mere individual. In the highest sense it is true that "it is not good for man to be alone;" for God recognizes and uses what philosophy did not take into account, the special complementary function of each human personality. Organic unity, not inorganic uniformity, was (as we have before said) the rationale of that community of the higher life which Christ inaugurated. The Apostle Paul clearly grasped this idea. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." 3 And again: "There are

¹ Col. iii. 14.

² Rom. xiii. 10.

³ Ibid. xii. 4, 5.

diversities of operations" (ἐνεργημάτων—Aristotle's word once more), "but it is the same God which worketh all in all." Thus the "well-being," the "happiness," the "blessedness," of the community, depending as it does on the performance of special work, is inseparably bound up with that of the individual, as the blessedness of the individual is with that of the community. For "whether one member suffer, all members suffer with it: or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it." 2 And so "from [Christ, the head] the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working (ἐνέργεια) in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."3 Is this not likewise the fulfilment of the φιλία ("friendship") of Aristotle, and of the half-formed vision of the έρως ("love") of Socrates and Plato—the striving together not only of two, but of a multitude of souls together after ὁμοιώσις θεῷ ("likeness to God")? And this too is a mutual striving after true "knowledge;" for "he that loveth not, knoweth not God: for God is love." Knowledge, it is to be carefully observed. Christianity does not by any means despise; but knowledge is made one of the fruits of love: "heavenly things must be loved to be known." The Apostle Paul 4 prays that "the love" of his converts "may abound in all knowledge." And when, in I Corinthians viii. I. he writes, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth," he is only warning his readers against a loveless knowledge. But true knowledge—the knowledge of "the

I Cor. xii. 6.

² Ibid. xii. 26. ³ Eph. iv. 16. 4 Phil. i. 9.

only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent"involves love, and is the blessedness of "eternal life." I And not without it do we become "partakers of the divine nature," 2 by the process (described in Ephesians iii. 16) through which the "whole family of the earth," without distinction of race, rank, or sex, may, if so they will, "be strengthened by the spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith, they having been rooted and grounded in love; in order that they may be able to comprehend what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, and so may be filled with all the fulness of God." Thus do "faith and love" raise us through the lower air of a mingled and imperfect blessedness on earth to a blessedness only to be compared with that of God in heaven. And the "sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life" clenches the blessedness of the life of love. "For this cause" they that are "troubled on every side faint not," but can regard their troubles as a "light affliction," 3 "looking for that blessed hope (τῆν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," 4 the sight of whom will be worth a thousand deaths. For then shall they "be redeemed from all iniquity, and purified unto him a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Then, and then alone, when love shall have acquired untrammelled power, shall Aristotle's idea of blessedness be fulfilled, "perfect virtue in a perfect life;" for if man is supremely blessed "so far as he is divine," 5 then surely will the truest

² John xvii. 3. ² Peter i. 4. ³ Cor. iv. 8, 16, 17. ⁴ Titus ii. 13. ⁵ Aristotle, *Ethics*, x. 7.

blessedness be his when he is filled with all the fulness of God." I And the "personal relation," we observe, which gives light to the earthly life, goes on to the last, and beyond the last. "Blessed (μακάριοι) are the dead," we read in Revelation xiv. 13 - not because they are beyond the reach of the $\phi\theta\dot{\phi}\nu\sigma$ s ("envy") of the deities, but—"that die in the Lord:" for as God is "blessed" (μακάριος θ εός)² (and that not because He is "careless of mankind," but rather because He is bound up in them), so shall they be μακάριοι in their union and fellowship with Him. Thus did the "Light of the world" intensify and make to converge in Himself all the rays which, shining uncomprehended in the darkness, He had poured here and there into thoughtful and earnest hearts. He accomplished the purpose of all systems of ethics, and embodied the "oneness of morality" by giving Himself as the object of faith and love. He realized the intent of a dead imperious external law by the constraint of a living, breathing, personal affection. He came to be and do, rather than to teach; and yet, so "shone his light before men," that from the being and the doing the teaching could not be severed. By a life of poverty gently endured He lent a force, unfelt before, to the old truth that "well-being" dwells apart from outward prosperity, and that "a man's life consisteth not in the things that he possesseth." On the "eternal sanctities." already extended to embrace "all righteousness," He cast a transfiguring light, Himself fulfilling and shewing mortal men how they could unfailingly avoid the "jealousy" of heavenly holiness. He was the "wise man," the "true judge, priest, and king," whom the

¹ Eph. iii. 19.

² I Tim. i. 11.

Stoics had dreamed of, but had never seen; "equal to God in all things essential," an incarnate testimony to the Divine dignity of the human; yet not "highminded," as though unbeholden to the King of kings. but "meek and lowly," as waiting upon a Father's will. wisdom, and goodness; nor yet "high-minded" as refusing to be "ministered unto," though He came most of all "to minister;" rising superior to all griefs, vet not by "grietlessness," for He was the "Man of sorrows;" nor by drying up the fountains of emotion, for He wept at the grave of Lazarus. Plato had commended virtue as health: He was the Healer; Plato had shrunk from vice as from disease: He was the Physician; the prophets had shuddered at sin as the barrier between God and man: He was the Reconciler. All the nobler schools had taught that "to seek truth and to do good "I was the path of real living: He was the Way, the Truth, and the Life. To genuine "knowledge," so extolled by Socrates and Plato, He opened up an avenue through a will-subduing love of Himself, in comparison with which the Eros of Plato and Socrates was a trackless waste: and the "striving of two souls" after such knowledge He made effectual by joining his own "striving" to that of any "two or three who should agree as touching anything that they should ask" of his "Father which was in heaven." Universal "friendship" had been the vision of Aristotle, and "comprehension" that of the Stoics: He was the bond that, by a union of hearts for mutual love and service, should in fulness of time "gather together in one all the chil-

Pythagoras' division of virtue—τό τε άληθεύειν καὶ τό εὐεργετεῖν: quoted from Ælian in Lecky's History of European Morals, vol. i. p. 54.

dren of God that were scattered abroad," "that they all might be one," Jew and Greek, male and female, bond and free. He stands forth as the object of "contemplation," not as a mental luxury, but lest frail men, in their hungering after God, should "grow weary and faint in their minds;" our example that we should walk in his steps, yet not an example that drives to "cold resignation" or despondency; for He has fulfilled the hidden thought of the "good genius," being "God with us," and by the might of his indwelling has endowed humanity with such superhuman strength that the chains of evil, outward or inward, need no longer keep man the prisoner of despair. Last of all, being not merely victor over the world, but the conqueror of death, and thereby imparting a "godliness profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come," He has raised ευδαίμων, even here, to an earnest of μακάριος, and transfigured the happiness of earth by the "lively hope" of the blessedness of heaven.

The word μακάριος remains the same, but its scope is infinitely widened: the "blessedness" of the philosophers was great, but "a greater than that blessedness is here." JOHN MASSIE.

ECCLESIASTES.

CHAPTER I. VERSES 12-18.

my heart to search and to investigate by means of wisdom concerning all that is done under heaven: it is a sore travail that God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised therewith. 14. I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and a striving after the wind. 15. That which is crooked cannot be made straight: and that which is wanting cannot be numbered. 16. I communed with my heart, saying. Lo, I have gotten far greater wisdom than all that were before me over Jerusalem: yea, my heart hath had great experience of wisdom and knowledge (Wt. my heart saw wisdom and knowledge in abund my). 17. And I gave my heart to know wisdom and knowledge, madness and foily: I know that this also is a striving after the wind. 18. Fr in much wisdom is much vexation: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

THE Preacher has uttered his disappointment, and the utterance has been a relief. He can now begin in a somewhat more collected mood to give us some passages of his autobiography. These will justify his complaint. He tells us who he was and how he came to form his opinions. He is speaking from his own experience and observation. He is no recluse, meditating in his cell on the vanity of life, and indulging in philosophical speculations upon nature and man. He was a king, and a despotic Eastern king, whose word was law, and who could follow his own bent; he reigned over a united people; he was wise and accomplished; he had had the most favourable opportunities of forming a judgment on men and things, and had made the best possible use of them.

It is in perfect keeping with the whole character of this Book, as reflecting the experience of Solomon, that Wisdom occupies so prominent a place in it. Here at the outset, when recording his experiments upon life, the Author tells us how he had used wisdom as the instrument by which to conduct his experiments; how he had enlarged his wisdom as he went on by his careful observation of men and things; how he had hoped, but hoped in vain, to find satisfaction in wisdom.

Verse 12.—We learn from the Midrash that some of the Rabbis had remarked, that this was properly the beginning of the Book. Rabbi Samuel, the son of Rabbi Isaac, observes: "The Book seems as if it ought to begin here;" and he accounts for this irregularity on the general principle that "there is 'no before and no after,' no systematic order in Scripture." Rabbi Ishmael repeats the same maxim, and illustrates the principle by reference to a number of other instances, amongst which he cites the Sixth Chapter of the Prophecy of Isaiah, which, he says, might naturally have been the opening of the prophecy; the Second Chapter of Jeremiah, the Seventeenth Chapter of Ezekiel; and the Twentysecond Verse of the Seventy-third Psalm. The last parallel is very instructive and significant, but it is by way of contrast rather than by way of likeness. For the Psalmist tells first of his victory over doubt, and then of the struggles through which he had passed; Ooheleth begins with his sorrow and weariness, and traces the steps by which he was led to faith and peace. But we must not linger now on a comparison between the Poet and the Philosopher. I shall hope to return to this subject hereafter.

I, Qoheleth, was king over Israel in Ferusalem. We

seem here to be furnished with some definite information concerning the author of this Book. He begins his confession by telling us who he was. Taking the words in connection with the inscription in the first verse, we might almost suppose that the question was settled. The treatise, according to the title, is "The words of Ooheleth, the Son of David, king in Jerusalem." And Ooheleth himself says, "I was king over Israel in Ferusalem." There was but one son of David who was king "over Israel in Jerusalem," and that was Solomon. And yet this very passage has been mainly relied on as convincing evidence that the author is not the historical Solomon, but some one in later times assuming his character; and we cannot do justice to the Verse, or to what follows, without some discussion of the question it raises. The argument rests (1) on the past tense of the verb, "I was king;" for how could Solomon have so spoken of himself, when he remained king to the end of his days? Is it not plain that a later writer uses the past tense because to him the reign of Solomon is long past, the fictitious Solomon of the Persian period looking back through the vista of centuries on the real Solomon, and describing what he was? (2) On the words "over Israel in Jerusalem," which indicate a writer living at a time subsequent to the division of the kingdom, when there was a "king over Israel" whose royal residence was not "in Jerusalem." And when we add to this the expression in Verse 16, "I have gained more wisdom than all that were before me over Jerusalem," the difficulty of supposing Solomon to be the author is immensely increased (see note on that Verse) and we are forced to the conclusion that

the writer is not Solomon, but a great literary artist reproducing in vivid imaginative touches, and with a singular knowledge of the human heart and a wide experience of human life, what he felt must have been the inner history of such a man as Solomon. The force of this latter argument is indisputable. That which turns on the use of the past tense in the Verse is not quite so conclusive as it may appear at first sight. The difficulty of the past tense was felt long ago by the Jewish interpreters. The story told in the Targum and in the Midrash Yalguth was probably an attempt to explain it. It runs thus: "When King Solomon was sitting upon the throne of his kingdom, his heart was greatly lifted up because of his riches, and he transgressed the word of God, and he gathered many horses and chariots and horsemen, and amassed much gold and silver, and married wives of foreign extraction; whereupon the anger of the Lord was kindled against him, and he sent against him Ashmodai the king of the demons, who drove him from the throne of his kingdom, and took away the ring from his hand (the ring famed in legend throughout the East for its magical virtues), and sent him forth to wander through the world. And he went through the towns and cities of the land of Israel with a staff in his hand, weeping and lamenting, and saving, 'I am Ooheleth, whose name was formerly called Solomon, and who was king over Israel in Jerusalem; but now I rule only over this staff." I

In the Midrash Qoheleth we read: "I Qoheleth was king. I was when I was, but now I am nothing.

¹ This legend received subsequently still further embellishment. See Jellineck, Beth ham-Midrash, ii. 86, 87.

R. Chanina, the son of Isaac, said (quoting these words): He saw three periods in his life. R. Yoden and R. Oniyah discussed the question. R. Yoden said: He (Solomon) was first king, then a private person, then king again; first wise, then foolish, then wise again; first rich, then poor, then rich again. But R. Oniyah said: First a private person, then a king, then a private person again; first foolish, then wise, then foolish again; first poor, then rich, then poor again."

I give these illustrations as shewing how the past tense has perplexed the oldest interpreters, and how deep was the interest felt in the question of Solomon's destiny.

Ibn Ezra, still clinging to the traditional authorship of the Book, tries to defend the use of the past tense by saying that Solomon puts himself in the position of his readers in future times, as though one of them might say, "He who speaks here was king," &c. His words are, "Solomon wrote it in his old age, as if saying to the generations to come, Such and such things I tried in my lifetime."

It is worth while to go a little deeper. Grammatically, the past tense of this verb may be rendered in three ways:—

- 1. (a) I have been. A strict perfect, implying that this state continues at the present moment: "I have been and still am." E.g., Psalm lxxxviii. 4 [5]: "I have been and still am as a man that hath no strength;" or (b) at least a past duration, as in Joshua i. 5: "As I have been with Moses, so will I be with thee."
- 2. I was. A simple aorist, as, e.g., in Deuteronomy xxiii. 7: "Thou wast a stranger;" Nehemiah i. 11: "For I was the king's cupbearer."

3. I am become, as in Psalm lxix. 8 [9]: "I am become a stranger unto my brethren." This is the sense which Grätz puts upon the verb here, as supporting his theory that the Book was written in the time of Herod the Great, so that the allusion is consequently to a parvenu king, who had not come to the throne in the way of legitimate succession.

Of these three possible meanings of the tense one only seems consistent with the context. All the tenses which follow are acrists; all refer mainly to a past experience. The obvious rendering, therefore, of the tense here is as an acrist, as it is rendered in our Authorized Version: "I the Preacher was king," and as it is rendered in the LXX., $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$, and in the Græc. Venet., $\nu \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \xi a$.

Still even this rendering is not absolutely decisive as to the question of authorship. Broken down in spirit, looking mournfully on the glory which he felt was passing away, seeing already about him the signs of decay, his kingdom impoverished, taxation ruinously heavy, the murmurs of disaffection rising on all sides, the monarch whose word had been law, and whose power had stretched from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, and whose name had been renowned for wisdom above all the children of the East, might well, in the bitterness of the contrast, speak of himself as one who once was king. "Du temps que j'étais roi," said Louis XIV., at the close of his reign, looking back on the past; and "the saying," remarks a recent writer, "is one of deep meaning and terrible truth."

^r When this note was first written, I was not aware that the parallel had been suggested by any other commentator. I have since been informed that it is to be found in the Speaker's Commentary.

² Arsène Houssaye, Galerie du XVIIIe Siècle. La Régence, p. 46.

He, too, was a king whose will had never been questioned, and who had been almost worshipped as a god; and he, too, felt his power slipping from his grasp before he was carried to his grave. History repeats itself; and of all the parallels in history there is none more striking or more complete than that between "the Wise King" of the Hebrews and "the Great Monarch" of the French nation. May not Solomon, therefore, in his last days, writing bitter things against himself, have indulged in the same vein? and is not this the explanation of the words, "I the Preacher was king"?

The similarity at first sight seems striking; and yet there is an obvious difference of tone between the words, "When I was king," meaning, "I could do such and such things; I could lead armies to victory; I could speak and be obeyed;" and the quiet tone of narrative with which a writer beginning his autobiographical reminiscences says, "I was king in Jerusalem;" and then goes on to enumerate the various experiments he had made and the pursuits in which he had been engaged. The one expression can hardly be adduced as an adequate illustration of the other.

Verse 13.—I gave my heart, &c. Here is a man not talking at random, but giving us the results of deliberate, careful, thoughtful inquiry. He had set himself "to search and to spy out concerning all that is done under heaven." The first verb is the more general, the second the more specific: the word to "spy out" is the word used of the spies who were sent by Joshua to explore the land of Canaan. Qoheleth wished in like manner to explore the whole field of human action. He wished not merely to collect and tabulate the facts,

but to understand the rationale of them. It is plain that by "all that is done under heaven" he means not physical facts and the Divine order of the universe, but the doings of men; the tangled web of human existence, with its strange moral contradictions, the phrase "under heaven" answering to the more common phrase "under the sun," so often repeated in this Book. "Like the good Caliph of Arabian story, 'the good Haroun Alraschid,' we may suppose that Qoheleth goes forth in disguise to visit all quarters of the city; to talk with barbers, druggists, calenderers, with merchants and mariners, with husbandmen and tradesmen, mechanics and artizans; to try conclusions with travellers and with the blunt wits of homekeeping men. He will look with his own eyes, and learn for himself what their lives are like; how they conceive of the human lot, and what, if any, are the mysteries which sadden and perplex them." I And he set himself to the investigation by means of wisdom. His wisdom is that which characterizes him: that which entitles him to speak; that which remained with, or stood by, him (Chap. ii. 9) in all his investigations. But he has scarcely mentioned his purpose when he complains also of the burden it cast upon him. Two things are to be noticed here: (a) the impulse under which he acted; (b) the manner in which he followed the impulse.

(a) If the outward world is a series of recurring phenomena leading to no discernible result, the study of human life, of character, passion, interest, motive, is not more satisfactory. And yet this is a task

¹ The Quest of the Chief Good. Expository Lectures on the Book Ecclesiastes, by Rev. S. Cox, p. 127.

from which man cannot withdraw himself. God has given it to him; it is the law of his being. He must weary himself with the everlasting riddle. The fascination is such that he cannot push it aside and forget it, if he would. Every seeker returns baffled from the attempt to solve it, and yet new seekers succeed, with fresh, eager, undaunted hope. This is God's gift to man, and there is surely a bitter irony in the words. This is the only gift, not the power to interpret the riddle, much less the power to effect any changes in the world, but only the power and the doom to carry on the weary search as long as man and the earth shall last. When the Preacher says that God has given this "to the sons of men," he does not of course mean to imply that the dull unthinking mass, who live merely for the day and for animal indulgence, busy themselves with such problems. It is himself of whom he is thinking chiefly. It is the master of wisdom who is thus driven to make proof of his wisdom. All men have not the wisdom, and therefore all have not the unquenchable impulse, nor taste the bitterness of the cup.

(b) It is of importance to remember that Qoheleth warns us at the outset that his self-imposed task had proved unsatisfactory. If he thought the impulse which he obeyed was one given of God, he does not profess to have obeyed it in a religious spirit. Hence it had become a torment to him. He was merely practising experiments upon life, its various charms, allurements, gratifications, to see what it had to offer. And such experiments exposed him to the peril of a secret pride and a secret selfishness, because he measured life by his own arbitrary standard, settled for

himself what constituted its perfection and imperfection, its good and evil; and instead of seeing men and things in the light of God, which would have given them their true harmony, saw them only in the mirror of his own human wisdom, which refracted and distorted them.

Verses 14, 15.—This is all that comes of his philosophical examination of man and his pursuits. The quest ends in nothing. The old cry of disappointment breaks from his lips, "All is vanity and a striving after the wind." The whole world seen in such a temper is out of joint. There are glaring disorders, there are grievous imperfections, whether in the social system or in the body politic, patent enough to a thoughtful observer. There is a perversity in human affairs which is terribly disheartening; there are great gaps where we look for completeness; instead of one harmonious plan, there are nothing but broken fragments; and the worst of it is that no wisdom avails to remedy these evils. Wisdom can discern them, can investigate their causes, but cannot permanently correct them. "That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be supplied," so as to complete the broken series.1

Having gained such a result in his investigation and

It is surprising that a verse, the meaning of which is so obvious and grammatically so certain, should have been so strangely misinterpreted as it has been by the Targum, with its Midrashic explanation, by Jerome, and by the Rabbinical interpreters generally, who explain it of the impossibility of those who have dealt corruptly in their lives appearing righteous hereafter in the presence of God, and being numbered with the righteous. This personal reference is totally out of the question. The LXX. are perfectly right in keeping to the neuter rendering. The Vulgate is as completely wrong: "Perversi difficile corriguntur, et stultorum infinitus est numerus," which may be an unquestionable truth, but is certainly not a rendering of the original.

research by means of wisdom, he reaches the conclusion that wisdom itself is nothing.

Verse 16.—"I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I have gained great and ever greater wisdom (lit. I have made great [my] wisdom and added to it) above all who were before me over [or, in] Jerusalem."

Again the Preacher reminds us of the singular advantages he had enjoyed in conducting this investigation. Not only was he a king, but he was a king whose reputation for wisdom was notorious. He had surpassed all his predecessors in this respect, "all who before me were over Jerusalem." If this rendering, "over Jerusalem," is correct, it points to a long line of kings, and then the obvious difficulty presents itself, How could such an expression be appropriate in the mouth of Solomon? There had been only one king before him over Jerusalem; for to suppose that the allusion is to Canaanite monarchs, beginning with Melchizedek and coming down to the times of David, is surely most extravagant. On the other hand, the difficulty is not much lessened if we render "in I Jerusalem," and suppose that not kings but sages are meant; 2 for who were the great sages who had preceded Solomon in Jerusalem with whom he compares himself?

We must leave this difficulty where we find it for the present. The point of Verses 16–18 is this, that the

There is a different preposition in some MSS. I instead of by, and the LXX., Syriac, and Jerome render "in Jerusalem;" but this does not prove, as Delitzsch infers, that they had the preposition I. For that by does not necessarily mean "over" in such a collocation as this, is plain from such a passage as Psalm lxviii. 29 [30], where the same preposition occurs with the same noun, and can only be rendered either "in Jerusalem," or, "up to Jerusalem.

So the Targum: "All the sages that have been in Jerusalem before me."

Preacher, confessedly the wisest man of his age and nation, had found no satisfaction in his wisdom. It had not helped him to read the riddle of life. It was as surely "vanity" as everything else "under the sun."

Verse 17.—" And I gave my heart to know wisdom

and knowledge, madness and folly."

There is not the slightest reason for any change of the text here, such as is proposed by Ginsburg and Grätz, who stumble at the words "madness and folly," as being out of place where the writer is giving us his judgment concerning wisdom. Ginsburg would strike out the words altogether, "as having crept into the text through the carelessness of a transcriber;" and Grätz would follow the LXX. (παραβολάς καὶ ἐπιστήμην) in reading m'shâlōth for holêluth, and taking the second word in the sense of knowledge (which has some support in its orthography) instead of folly. But surely the contrast here gives a deeper view of the wisdom. There is something to be learned in "madness and folly." In that reckless abuse of powers designed for better ends, in that waste of mind and body in sottish pleasures and criminal indulgence, is there no lesson for wisdom—no lesson of pity and sweet charity and heavenly mercy, on the one hand, as well as of thankfulness for having chosen the better part on the other? and may not a man be made richer and purer and stronger by knowing "madness and folly" as well as "wisdom and knowledge"? The error, no doubt, in the case of the Preacher, lay here, that he did not seek to know "madness and folly" in this spirit. He looked at them with the eye of a critic, with the eye of a man who wanted to dissect the world, keeping his head cool and his hand steady. But even with this

end in view, he was right in weighing "madness and folly" in the scales, as well as "wisdom and knowledge," that he might gain a larger and a riper and a deeper judgment of that strange existence whose contrasts were so alluring and so instructive. The tree of the knowledge of good and cvil still stands, and still tempts man with its fruit, though Paradise is lost.

Verse 18.—But wisdom cannot heal the wounded spirit. It is fruitful in sorrow. Is not this the pathetic confession of all who have ever tried the experiment? Melancholy sits throned on the forehead of all the masters of earthly wisdom. He who can take the largest survey of the human theatre, sees also most plainly, feels most deeply, the littleness of the actors, the fragmentariness of the scene, the hollowness of the mummery and the painting. In much "knowledge" of the world "is much sorrow." Byron calculated that he had passed in his whole life eleven happy days. And Nelson envied him alone "whose undisturbable possession lies six feet below the earth." And Goethe puts this into the mouth of Mephistopheles as the only consolation for Faust—

Oh, credit me, who still as ages roll Have chew'd this bitter fare from year to year; No mortal, from the cradle to the bier, Digests the ancient leaven.

We shall see later on in the Book how heavy the miseries of men, "the burden and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world," lay on the Preacher's heart. Even in the light of a clearer revelation the burden is not wholly removed. It is still often true that he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

Incarnate Wisdom itself was sorrowful in profound sympathy with the woes and griefs of mankind. In all the disciples of that Wisdom there must be sorrow as well as joy. It will only be in another world that the curse of knowledge shall cease, and "sorrow and sighing flee away."

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

A BIBLICAL NOTE.

COLOSSIANS I. 3-5.

The consensus of Erasmus and Calvin, De Wette, Meyer, Ellicott, and Lightfoot, with the Greek commentators, ought surely, one would expect, to mark a *certain* interpretation. Yet there seem to be strong reasons for hesitating to accept their judgment—united and confident, and therefore all but decisive as it is—in regard to the connection of $\delta \iota \dot{u} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu i \lambda \pi i \delta a$ (in Verse 5) with the foregoing context.

a. They hold that this phrase is an adjunct of Verse 4, stating that which 'evokes and conditions' the Colossians' love (Meyer and

Ellicott); or faith and love (so De Wette and Lightfoot).

b. The alternative view regards it as dependent on εὐχαριστοῦμεν (Verse 3), and giving the reason of the Apostle's thanksgiving: "Ex spe patet quanta sit causa gratias agendi pro dono fidei et amoris" (Bengel). The names of Athanasius, Calovius, Michaelis, Storr, Hofmann, Conybeare, and Eadie, amongst others who unite with Bengel in adopting this connection of the words, are sufficient to shew that, after all, the weight of critical authority is divided, and that the question may be regarded as still open to discussion.

It may be observed, in passing, that the various reading in Verse 4 does not materially affect the point at issue, although $\hat{\eta}^{\nu}$ $\xi \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, now generally preferred, makes the connection of $\delta i \hat{\alpha} \tau$. $\delta \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha$ with $\delta \gamma \delta \pi \eta \nu$

somewhat easier and more regular.

The grounds on which a is based by Meyer, Ellicott, and Lightfoot are chiefly negative, consisting of objections to b. Let us examine them one by one.

1. Meyer is determined by two considerations: the first—adopted by Ellicott and Alford, both of whom regard it as fully conclusive by itself—is that "this preliminary εὐχαριστία in St. Paul's Epistles is

always grounded on the subjective state 1 of his converts" (Ellicott). To this Eadie's reply is perhaps sufficient. "Faith and love," he says, "are not excluded from the grounds of thanksgiving, and hope laid up is not wholly objective, as it signifies a blessing so sure and attainable that it creates hope." But the rule above given surely proves nothing to the point, unless it be understood to mean that the Apostle always grounds his preliminary είγαοιστία on subjective state alone. In that form it strikes one as somewhat empirical, and one asks for a reason why St. Paul should so carefully keep the objective out of sight in this particular matter. Finding no answer to this query, one is tempted to ask whether he does so exclude it? And, turning to the very next Epistle, we find him giving thanks to God for the Thessalonians, remembering their "work of faith, and toil of love, and patience of hope, knowing, brethren beloved by God, your election;" where Ellicott says of ellorec k. 7. 2.—"participial clause, parallel to μνημομείοντες, and similarly dependent on είχαριστούμεν." Is election then a 'subjective state'?

It is clear that in the Thessalonian εἰγαριστία the gratifying state of that Church leads the Apostle's thoughts back to God's antecedent choice of them and gracious purposes towards them, of which he had been already persuaded by what he saw and felt when amongst them (Verse 5), as well as by their whole subsequent behaviour, with its happy effect on others (Verses 6-10). There is no break anywhere from the εὐχαριστοῦμεν of Verse 2 to the end of the Chapter. The thanksgiving has a fulness of scope corresponding both to the facts of the case and to the cumulative richness so characteristic of the Apostle's more solemn passages.

Similarly, in Philippians i. 3-6, his confidence in God's purpose towards the Philippians shares with their 'fellowship in the gospel' in prompting his $Ei\chi a \rho \iota \sigma \pi \sigma$ r. $\theta \iota \nu \rho$ $\mu \sigma r$. The subjective suggests the objective, passes into it, and blends with it in the most free and natural way. In Romans i. 8, moreover, is the fact that the faith of the Roman Christians was being 'spoken of throughout the whole world' an element of their subjective state?

The truth rather seems to be that in his preliminary $\epsilon i \chi \alpha \rho_i \sigma \tau i a$ the Apostle, as a rule, naturally dwells first on the matter of thankfulness he has in the condition of those to whom he is writing, and then passes from that to whatever other motive of gratitude their state and his own thoughts at the time suggest to one who ever delights to act upon his own precept, $\ell \nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau \ell \epsilon i \chi \alpha \rho_i \sigma \tau \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$.

^{*} The italics are my own.

2. Meyer further objects that διά with accusative never occurs else-where in the New Testament after εὐχαριστέω.

But is there any reason why it should not on occasion?

'Eπί is the preposition in regular use in the New Testament to indicate the object after verbs of emotion," and it is found with Elizapiaτέω and equivalent expressions in I Corinthians i. 4; 2 Corinthians ix. 15; Philippians i. 3, 5; 1 Thessalonians iii. 9. Υπέρ, however, takes its place in 1 Corinthians x. 30; Ephesians v. 20; while περί (with genitive of thing as well as of person) is found in later Greek. In 2 Corinthians i. 11 this verb is even used in the passive with χάρισμα as subject (as though it might take in the active a simple accusative of the thing).2 Clearly εθχαριστέω is far from being fixed and uniform in the construction it requires. Kindred verbs shew a similar variety. Thus θαυμάζω is found with accusative of thing in Luke xxiv. 12; with ἐπί in Luke ii. 33, &c.; and with διά in Mark vi. 6 and (probably) John vii. 21.3 Χαίρω, with its equivalents, takes most frequently ¿πί, as in 1 Corinthians xiii. 6; Philemon 7; but also ¿v and διά in John iii. 29 and 1 Thessalonians iii. 9. Εὐχαριστέω διά seems, therefore, to be fully justified by analogy.

Eadie finds a special reason for this preposition here in the fact that Verse 4 intervenes between the verb and the prepositional phrase, so that the connection of thought undergoes modification. Perhaps the prepositions we have found following $\epsilon i \chi \alpha \rho_i \sigma \tau \delta \omega$ might be thus distinguished: ' $E\pi i$ denotes the occasion or incentive; $i \pi \delta \rho$ (or $\pi \epsilon \rho i$), the subject-matter or concernment; and $\delta i \delta$ (as with any other verb), the reason or ultimate motive of the act of thanksgiving.

3. Lightfoot, without referring to the argument of his predecessors, gives three reasons of his own which "seem decisive in favour of connecting $\partial u = \lambda \lambda \pi i \partial u = \lambda \lambda \pi i \partial u = \lambda \lambda \nu$ " The first is the great distance of Verse 5 from $\partial u = \lambda \lambda \nu = \lambda \lambda \nu$ "

But is the distance so very great for St. Paul? Compare the interval which separates ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις in Colossians iii. 14 from the verb it qualifies.

Verse 4 does not form any interruption of the current of thought, such as might make it difficult for the reader to keep the principal verb in mind till he arrived at $\delta\iota\dot{a}$ τ . $\delta\lambda\pi\dot{a}\delta a$. Read the sentence thus: "We give thanks to God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, always praying for you, at the report of your faith in Christ Jesus and

¹ Moulton's Winer, p. 491.

See A. Buttmann's New Testament Grammar, p. 148, English Translation.
 See Meyer in loc.

your love to all the saints,—because of the hope laid up for you in heaven; "and with a slight pause before the last clause, and a little emphasis upon it, the connection is perfectly clear of itself, and the whole runs smoothly and easily enough. Hoogenyópeno κ , τ , λ , gives the explanation as regards himself: $\hat{a}\kappa o i\sigma a v \tau \epsilon \lambda$, the occasion and subjective ground as regards the Colossians; and $\hat{c}i\hat{a}$ τ , $i\lambda\pi i\hat{c}a$ κ , τ , λ , the motive and objective ground of the Apostle's thanksgiving, as consisting in that of which their faith and love assured him, and in which he most rejoiced on their account. Here everything is in order, and $ii\hat{a}$ τ , $i\lambda\pi i\hat{c}a$ is only separated from $ii\chi a p i \sigma \tau \hat{o} i \kappa \tau \hat{o}$ by that which prepares for it, and leads up to it.

4. The last consideration anticipates Lightfoot's third argument, on which he lays most stress, viz., that by attaching Verse 5 to εὐχα-οιστοῦκεν, "the triad of Christian graces, which St. Paul delights to associate together, would be broken up."

Are they not in reality closely and strikingly combined, when the faith and love of the Colossians are represented as together assuring the Apostle of the hope that awaits them—a hope ensuing so certainly on such faith and love, that he gives thanks for it, as if already realized? The same combination appears to recur, more subtly expressed and with greater elaboration, in Ephesians i. 15-18; where, on hearing of the Ephesians' faith and love, he ceases not to give thanks for them, with prayer that they may have enlightenment to 'know what is the hope' of their calling. The inference of 2 Thessalonians i. 3-5, and of Philippians i. 27, 28, is essentially similar: here, moreover, the argument is two-edged—made to cut both ways.

5. Lightfoot's second objection is drawn from the following $\hat{\eta}_{\nu}$ $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\kappa\sigma\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$, which, he thinks, "suggests that the words $\hat{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}$ $\tau.i\lambda\pi\dot{\epsilon}\hat{\epsilon}\alpha$ describe the motives of the Colossians for well-doing," rather than the reasons of the Apostle for thanksgiving."

It strongly suggests to me, through some obtuseness perhaps, the very opposite. Why does St. Paul say that they had heard the gospel already ($\pi\rho\circ\eta\kappa\circ\iota\sigma\sigma\sigma\tau\epsilon$)? that it had come to them as to all the world, and in all the world was bearing fruit and growing? that they had learnt it from Epaphras, his beloved fellow-servant, who had brought such good tidings from them? What is there specially

¹ See Meyer in loc.

² By the way, is it quite fair to make faith and love here equivalent to well-doing? True, they are motives and principles of well-doing, and so is hope; but the question here is respecting hope as the motive of faith and love. See, however, § 6, below.

appropriate or forcible in all this, regarded as explaining the Colossians' 'motives for well-doing'? or germane to the thought that their faith and love were animated by the hope of glory? What had the time or means of their hearing the gospel to do with this motive? Does not the Apostle even seem to be giving his readers information in what he says of its wide and rapid diffusion? The longer one looks at Verses 5-8, the more one is convinced (in spite of extreme deference to the dictum quoted) that the whole passage presents considerations acting on the mind of the Apostle himself. That the work he had set on foot was so blessedly extending and propagating itself; that beyond the bounds of his own personal ministry the gospel—his gospel—had been so successfully preached; that the great 'hope' was thus actually becoming the possession of the Gentiles, for whose claim to it he had gladly sacrificed liberty and life; and that he had heard all this from Epaphras, probably his own son in the faith, -can we imagine anything that would stir the Apostle's gratitude to God more profoundly? Not otherwise does he give thanks for the Roman brethren, that their "faith is published abroad in all the world." And the sustained outburst of thanksgiving with which his first Epistle opens cannot reach its pause till he has recounted how that "from you hath sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad, so that we need not to speak anything." If he could rejoice in the preaching of Christ by others, even 'in pretence' and 'of contentiousness,'2 how much more in what Epaphras had done in Colossæ!

In reviewing the objections brought against $\epsilon i \chi a \rho i \sigma \tau \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\mu} \epsilon \nu \ldots \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\mu} \tau$. $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \tilde{\epsilon} a$, the positive argument in favour of that connection has been in great part already stated. It only remains further to confront the two interpretations together, and to inquire whether St. Paul's line of thought in this and neighbouring Epistles helps to a decision between them.

6. That a appears to put love—or faith and love—on a selfish basis' (Eadie), is an objection that recurs again and again in spite of every attempt to remove it; and that, to some minds at least, approaches the insuperable. The sentiment it expresses one might call Paley-an rather than Pauline. No New Testament parallel of any kind is forthcoming to support the notion that "love towards the $\mbox{iiy} \omega$ is evoked and conditioned by hope for the $\mbox{pi} \sigma \theta \omega$ in heaven."

¹ Lightfoot, p. 31.

² Phil. i. 15–18.

True it is attended with this hope, and stimulates, and is stimulated and enriched by it in turn. Had the Apostle said 'in view of the hope,' or (as in Titus i. 2) 'in hope of eternal life,' though the adjunct would have been unusual in this connection, it would not have presented the difficulty which arises when he is supposed to say 'because of the hope,' making future reward, simply and without any qualification, the reason of love. This is surely to reverse the true and Pauline order as set forth in Romans v. 1-5; viii. 28-39; xv. 13; Ephesians i. 13. 14: and Lightfoot secures a closer grammatical and verbal connection of 'the triad' only at the expense of their real and logical order. We are "children, then heirs;" it is "love" that "hopeth all things."—"perfect love" which "casteth out fear" and gives "boldness in the day of judgment." And as Eadie well says: "Of all the graces, love has the least of self in its nature, and its instinctive gratification is its own disinterested reward."

7. Reading onwards in the Epistle, to see how its general analogy bears on the question in hand, we find the Apostle closing his praver for the Colossians, following immediately upon the εὐχαριστία, by asking that they may be filled with knowledge and walk worthily, "with joy giving thanks to the Father, who made you meet for your share in the inheritance of the saints in the light" (a possession belonging in full realization only to the future). We behold him "rejoicing in his sufferings" (Verse 24) with a joy full of the thought of "Christ in you (Colossian Gentiles), the hope of glory" (Verse 27). If he warns, it is "that no man defraud you of your Bραβείοr—the prize of your high calling."2 If he promises, it is that "when Christ your Life shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with him in glory." If he comforts the oppressed slave, it is with the knowledge that "from the Lord ye shall receive the just recompense of the inheritance." Nor is it without significance that at the same time he suggests to Philemon that he has "perhaps lost his bondsman for a short season, that he might recover him for ever as a brother beloved."4

We pass to the twin Ephesian Letter, whose opening ascription of praise reaches its sublime climax in the thought of *the inheritance* which, according to God's preordaining purpose, we obtained, "we who have first *hoped* in Christ;" and of the seal of the Spirit which "ye also" received as an "earnest of our inheritance." The prayer,

² I Cor. xiii. 7; I John iv. 17, 18.

³ Col. iii. 24.

⁴ Phil. 15.

² Col. ii. 18, and Phil. iii. 14.

⁵ Eph. i. 11–14.

already referred to in § 4, which follows and grows out of this act of praise, as antistrophé out of strophé, looks quite in the same direction; as also does the fact that the Apostle characterizes the Gentiles as "having no hope, and without God in the world," but as now to be "fellow-heirs and of the same body" with the Jewish Church.²

We come, finally, to that Epistle (nearly contemporaneous, as all agree, with these two) in which, as in no other, the Apostle opens wide his heart—to his loving and beloved Philippians. "Summa epistolæ," says Bengel, "gaudeo, gaudete;" and the 'crown of his rejoicing' is 'that blessed hope.' Philippians i. 10, 21-23, ii. 16, and especially iii. 11-21, give abundant evidence to this effect; while Philippians i. 6 is strictly parallel to Colossians i. 5, and completes the agreement of the ελχαριστίαι of the three great Epistles of this period in their prevailing reference to the *future consummation* of the work of grace.3 On the whole it appears that the heavenly βραβεῖον greatly occupied St. Paul's mind, and especially his feeling at this particular time —a time for him, it must be remembered, of contemplation rather than of action, of extreme trial and suspense, and when, under the constant imminence of death, he had learned better than ever how to estimate its 'gain.' 'The hope in store for us in heaven'—this was the source of his deep comfort and joy as 'the prisoner of the Lord,' and 'in deaths oft,' and the object of his most fervent anticipations and earnest solicitude both for himself and for his children in Christ. wrong therefore in supposing that εὐχαριστοῦμεν διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα strikes the true keynote of the thanksgivings of the Epistles of the First Roman Captivity? GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

¹ Eph. ii. 12.

² Ibid. iii. 6.

³ Comp. also I Cor. i. 4-8.

THE PARADON OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

GALATIANS VI. 1-5.

PERHAPS the various systems of moral philosophy which have divided the minds of men may be classified under two great heads - those whose centre is the personal, and those whose centre is the sympathetic. There are some which have professed to base morality upon the good of the individual, in other words, to make self-interest the ground of moral action. There are others which have striven to eliminate altogether the idea of self-interest, and to find the basis of morality in the love of universal being. Between these extremes there are many schemes of reconciliation, which seek to harmonize the interests of the individual with the disinterested love of universal being; yet it does not seem to us that any of these schemes are pre-Christian, or apart from Christian influence. It is not alone in matters theological that Christianity has been a reconciling power; wheresoever it has penetrated it has brought unity out of diversity, and the secular as well as the sacred world has profited by the breaking down of its walls of partition. To the moral region, as to all other regions, there has come a form of eclecticism which has exhibited itself rather in the meeting, than in the compromise, of extremes; but the bond which has effected this union is nothing less than Christianity itself. VOL. X. AUGUST, 1879.

"Bear ye one another's burdens, for every man must bear his own burden," are the striking words in which is conveyed the fact that Christianity has joined the poles of moral opposition. The conjunction of the poles does not at first sight strike the mind as natural; it has all the effect of a paroxysm, and all the force of a paradox. There have been men impressed with the weight of their own burden, and there have been men chiefly impressed with the weight of the burden of others; but it does not naturally occur to either of these that there is any possibility of a logical connection between them. How little such a connection occurs to the common thoughts of men will only be fully seen when we revert to the time when Christianity was not yet a power in the world. If we would see how strongly the Christian atmosphere has contributed to produce the idea of a possible union between self-interest and the interest of others, we must strive to approach the moral world ere yet it had received the Christian atmosphere; we must endeavour to view it in its unaided condition, and study its efforts to work out the problem alone. The result of that study will inevitably be the conviction that the pre-Christian world did not solve the problem, and the clearer recognition of the fact that the connection between the individual and the race is a direct product of the Christian consciousness

There may be said to be three great national types of morality in the ancient world—the philosophic Greek, the Buddhist, and the Jew. The Greek was occupied solely with the question how a man was to bear his own burden. Great as was the difference between the Stoic and the Epicurean, they were at one

in this, that the leading aim of both was the securing of individual happiness. They sought that happiness in different, in some respects in opposite, ways; yet the object they sought was essentially the same. The Epicurean started with the pursuit of personal enjoyment, and professed to find his goal in that balance of the sensuous pleasures which produces an equable calm. The Stoic started with the revulsion from personal enjoyment, and professed to find his happiness in that devotion to abstract virtue which disregards alike life's pleasures and its pains. Yet, unconsciously to themselves, the Epicurean and the Stoic had met: what the one called personal enjoyment was simply what the other called virtue. The Epicurean tried to balance the pleasures of the senses, and received as his reward the sense of an unruffled calm; the Stoic tried to be indifferent to life's pleasures and pains, and he called that Epicurean calm of indifference by the exalted name of virtue. There was no practical divergence in their morality; they both had one goal, and that goal was self-preservation. How a man was to bear his own burden, how he was to save his soul alive, and how he was to preserve his individual dignity and avoid his individual dangers, was the all-absorbing question in the moral meditations of the Greek. Even the lofty morality of Platonism is only lofty on this one side—the aspiration of the individual soul after the preservation of its own individual purity. Its virtues never rise into the region of selfsacrifice; its precepts never soar beyond the duties of self-restraint. The nearest approach they make to the love of the human brotherhood is in the inculcation of bare justice between man and man; they see not

yet that generosity transcends justice. To be prudent, to be temperate, to be brave, to be incapable of yielding to the seduction of material things, are the only moral heights to which the Greek mind, in its highest moral representative, has ever dared to aspire: the element of self-seeking shuts out the element of sacrifice, and through all its precepts there runs the one refrain, "Every man must bear his own burden."

Exactly at the opposite remove from the Greek stands the ethical life of the Buddhist. If the refrain of Greek morality is, "Every man must bear his own burden," the refrain of Buddhist life is, "Bear ye one another's burdens." The moral peculiarity of Buddhism is its search for brotherhood. It is this quest which has made it a missionary power in the world, which has prompted it to break down caste and to proclaim the universal priesthood of humanity. Yet here we find the very opposite error to that which had influenced the Greek mind. The Greek, in his devotion to individualism, forgot the interests of brotherhood; the Buddhist, in his devotion to brotherhood, forgot the interests of individualism. His aim was essentially the sacrifice of self, and he contemplated that sacrifice as in itself an end. He viewed it, not as the Christian views it—as a source of spiritual enrichment to the life of the individual soul, but as a gulf of nothingness into which the individual soul might empty out its individuality. Self-sacrifice was to the Buddhist a means of suicide, and he welcomed it because it was a means of suicide. He was weary of his own personality, and he wanted above all things to get rid of it. His efforts to live for others were prompted chiefly by his desire to die. That desire of death was the only one which he permitted himself to indulge. He held that man had reached the crown of his being when he was able to wish that he might wish for nothing. Goaded on by that impulse of self-recklessness, the Buddhist plunged into the sea of human brotherhood, and succeeded in bringing to the shore many a ship-wrecked and drowning mariner; yet his efforts to save life were dictated by the conviction that life was not worth saving, and his work for the good of others was prompted by the despair of his own.

Between these two extremes of the Greek and the Buddhist the Jew stands as an intermediary, or rather as one who attempts without success to mediate. The morality of Judaism is, philosophically speaking, an effort at reconciliation between Greek individualism and Indian self-forgetfulness. It strives to give prominence to both. It prescribes to the personal life a definite number of duties which it holds to be necessary to warrant his membership in the Jewish commonwealth; but, on the other hand, it sets apart in its Decalogue a distinct table of duties which it considers to be binding upon one man towards another. Here there is at least an attempt to meet the two sides of the great problem. It must be confessed, however, that, in defining the relations of man to man, the code of Judaism is by no means so complete as in defining the duties of man to himself. Its individualism is stronger than its humanism. If we take the second table of the Decalogue as an exhibition of the impersonal side of Jewish ethics, we shall be struck with the fact that, with one exception, there is no positive duty demanded from man to man. In the Chapter of Galatians which we have made the basis of this inquiry,

St. Paul declares that the bearing of one another's burdens is the fulfilling of the law of Christ. He evidently uses the expression "law of Christ" in anti-thesis to the law of Moses. He clearly implies that the law of Moses never reached the positive stage of burden-bearing; it only attained the negative stage of abstaining from injury. It did not formally enjoin a man to do good to his neighbour; it confined him to the injunction not to hurt his neighbour. The virtuous man in relation to others was he who could keep the precepts of the law, beginning with the words, "Thou shalt not." It was reserved for another religion to inculcate a morality of love, whose precepts had the positive ring, "Thou shalt." The one solitary exception is that commandment which exhorts to the honouring of parents; yet even this does not reach to the conception of burden-bearing, while the promise of personal profit which is attached to its performance brings back the precept within the range of individual interests. Whatever of absolute morality may be implied in the Jewish law, there is expressed in that law only one half of the "categorical imperative" which legislates to the conscience its code of human brotherhood. It emphasizes the fact that man must cease to do evil. but it does not formally express the precept that he must learn to do well. The great problem which divided the heathen world still remains unsolved, and the duty which the individual owes to himself has as yet found no satisfactory point of union with the duty which he owes to his brother.

That reconciliation which Judaism failed to effect has at length been worked out by Christianity. Here, for the first time, a really successful effort has been

made to strike the balance between self-preservation and self-forgetfulness. In the first five Verses of this Sixth Chapter of Galatians we are introduced to an ethical scheme whose very conception indicates the deep spiritual insight of its author. It seems to us that in this remarkable passage the Apostle has embodied his views in three distinct principles, which yet combine to produce the unity of the Christian life. First, in opposition to the Greek spirit of individualism, he declares that the spiritual are the most sympathetic. Second, in opposition to the Buddhist spirit of self-annihilation, he declares that the sympathetic are the most self-reflective. Third, as a bond of final and permanent union between these, he declares that the pain of self-reflection is removed by the sense of sympathy. At each of these in succession we must briefly glance.

1. The Apostle affirms that the spiritual man, that is, the man of the highest individuality, is he whose life is least contained within himself, who is most sympathetic towards others. "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness." The language is not such as we should have expected. It might have been thought that St. Paul, in seeking out helpers for the fallen, would have appealed to those whom he knew to be themselves in the same condemnation. It might have been expected that he would have used such language as this: "Ye who yourselves have been overtaken in a fault, ye who know what it is to be tempted, I appeal to you to shew some charity to those who have surprised the world, and surprised themselves, by a sudden fall from virtue." But St. Paul knew better. He was far too deep a discerner of human nature not to see that the fallen have no sympathy with the fallen, that purity alone can pardon, that the spiritual alone can restore. The Christian paradox is here, after all, only a paradox to the worldling. The moment a man becomes spiritual, he becomes conscious of the fact that his want of spirituality constituted his want of charity. Sin is selfishness, and selfishness is one-sided individualism. A bad man cannot love even badness, unless it be in his own breast. He hates in others the sins which he himself holds most dear; he would most severely punish in others the fault for whose committal he claims a special license. St. Paul practically tells the fallen not to go to the fallen for sympathy, but to seek forgiveness from those who are not in their own condemnation. The spiritual, he says, alone can restore; for they alone are able to place themselves in thought on a level of equality with those whose wounds they bind. The act of restoration demands the "spirit of meekness" in him who performs it; it demands that the restorer should not throw down his pardon from the summit of a lofty eminence, but that he should himself first descend from the eminence, and, standing upon the common soil of brotherhood, hold out his hand to lift the fallen.

It will be seen that the Apostle claims for this principle an essentially Christian origin. To carry it out is in his view to "fulfil the law of Christ." It is the law of Christ because it is the life of Christ. If the spirit of charity, the ability to bear the weaknesses of others, is proportionate to the amount of spirituality in him who is called to bear them, it follows indisputably that the most successful of all burden-bearers must be

the Son of Man. It is announced, as a distinguishing feature of the Son of Man, that He has power to forgive sins. There is more emphasis laid on his passive than on his active power, more stress put on his ability to bear than on his ability to do. And the reason is plain: his passive power is the special proof of his spirituality. It is just because his nature is the purest of all natures that his charity is the most outflowing of all charities: containing within Himself all perfections, He bears within Himself every burden of the imperfect. If we place, as a mere ethical study, the figure of the Master over against the figure of the disciples, we shall find that the prominent difference between them consists in their ideal of power. The disciples habitually reverence the power which manifests itself in action; they seek the twelve thrones on which they may judge the world, and aspire to sit in the kingdom at the right and left hand of the Father. The Master, on the other hand, idealizes the power of suffering; He seeks no greater glory than to bear the sins of humanity, aspires to no higher crown than the love inspired by sacrifice. The difference is not one upon the surface; it implies even more than it reveals. It is neither more nor less than the difference between spirituality and selfishness. Where a man's ideal is, there his heart will be; for his ideal is only the measure of his heart seen outwardly. He who reverences active power reverences his own individuality in opposition to the individuality of others; he who desires the good of others proves by the very breadth of the desire that his own individual nature is enriched by the element of love. The Son of Man, because he is the Son of Man, because his own individual nature is

the highest of all, because He is the purest spiritual existence which the world has yet seen, is the existence of all others most accessible to the impure. The writer to the Hebrews says that the High Priest of the Christian faith is One who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, although Himself without sin: he might have said, because Himself without sin. According to the Christian system, it is just the sinlessness of the Son of Man which makes Him a successful sin-bearer, just the sinfulness of the sons of men which makes them unable to bear sin. The thought runs like a thread through the whole Gospel narrative. Christ forgives those special forms of evil which are most alien to his nature, and which his disciples cannot forgive, because they are the forms most akin to their own. They come to the gates of a Samaritan village which, in the spirit of intolerance, are closed against them. The disciples see in that intolerance a picture of their own narrowness and bigotry; but the recognition adds to, instead of palliating, the sin. They are for no half measures, no tempering of justice with mercy. They desire to express their indignation by the exaction of a full and adequate penalty, and will be satisfied with nothing less than the descent of the avenging fire from heaven. But there is one spirit among them whose nature is absolute tolerance. The Son of Man has never from the beginning harboured within his heart one thought of Jewish bigotry: to Him alone of all that company the intolerance of Samaria is an alien thing. Yet of all that company He alone has mercy for the intolerant. Perfect charity alone is willing to spare the uncharitable. The disciples, recognizing their own image in

another, are ready to consume it with the fire of the Inquisition; the Son of Man, beholding in that other the image contrary to his own, finds in the very contrariety a remembrance of the truth that He has not come to destroy, but to save. If, again, we pass from the gates of the Samaritan village into the precincts of the sacred Temple, we shall find an illustration of the principle which is not less marked, and not less remarkable. A woman detected in a life of impurity is brought up for judgment: her accusers are a company of men whose merit consists in the fact that they have not been detected. This is clearly the conclusion which is meant to be conveyed by their inability to respond to the challenge, "He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone at her." Every man of that company is conscious in his heart of the same impurity, and therefore every man of that company is clamorous against the manifested image of his own sin. But in the midst of the Temple there stands the solitary figure of the Son of Man, solitary by its contrast of stainlessness. Here alone there is a heart to which the sin of this woman, whether in its thought or in its manifestation, is absolutely alien, a nature which is utterly foreign to the slightest taint of impurity, and utterly unconscious of any participation in the moral stain. Yet it is from this heart alone that there proceeds a voice of mercy. The undetected participants in the detected woman's sin are eager to annihilate the detection by destroying the object that reveals it; the Son of Man, from the pure depths of his unstained soul, looks out upon the victim of a guilty world's judgment, and restores her in the spirit and in the words of meekness: "I do not condemn thee: go, and sin no more."

We have studied to present these incidents without embellishment or ornament. We have done little more than reproduce in synonymous terms the simple and graphic narratives of the Christian portraiture. The character of that portraiture is indeed so manifest that it speaks for itself better than any apologist can speak for it. And the whole burden of its voice is the delineation in detail of what Paul concentrates in a paradox. That the most self-developed mind is the mind least self-contained, that the purest soul is the soul most forbearing to the impure, that the most spiritual life is everywhere the most sympathetic life, is the burden of the Pauline morality, and the concentrated essence of the Gospel narrative. In the very utterance of this paradox Christianity has overleaped at one bound the limits of Greek individualism, and has placed the goal of human ethics in the relation of man to his fellow-

2. But there is another side to the problem, which Christianity has not left untouched, and which in this Sixth Chapter of Galatians St. Paul has not failed to notice. If the religion of Christ is opposed to that Greek individualism which consists in providing entirely for self-interest, it is equally opposed to that Buddhist universalism which consists in losing sight of self-interest altogether. If the Apostle repudiates the notion that man as a moral being should live for himself, he equally repudiates the notion that his moral life for others should be prompted by the desire for self-extinction. On the contrary, he distinctly holds and clearly states that, if the spiritual are the most sympathetic, the sympathetic are, in their turn, the most self-reflective; in other words, that the individual

truly gains his life in the very process of losing it. "Restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another." The idea here is that the man who is best able to bear the sins of others is he who is best able to measure his own moral stature; and for this very reason, that he measures his stature, not by those shortcomings of others which he needs to pardon, but by the exalted height of absolute purity itself. Let us try to enter into the inward process of St. Paul's reasoning; there is always more in the mind than in the actual writing of this Apostle. He asks in effect: What is the reason that men of a low spiritual stature are unable to bear away, or in any measure to condone, the faults of others? And in effect he answers: Because they rejoice in these faults. They experience a pleasure in the sight of a badness more glaring, or at least more openly manifested, than their own, because in such an open manifestation they seem to find a contrast to themselves. In comparing their own evil with the more patent evil of others, they experience an imitation of the sense of virtue which is all the more pleasant from its novelty; and they are naturally unwilling to throw a veil over that vision of a brother's deformity which enables them in comparison to appropriate to themselves the attribute of beauty. But, says St. Paul: Why adopt such a relative standard of measurement? Why not "prove your own work, and have rejoicing in yourself alone?" At present you are only "rejoicing in another;" you are deriving a base counterfeit of the sense of virtue from comparing your badness with the worse badness

of your neighbour. Why not try to get the sense of virtue itself by plunging into the depths of your own consciousness, and bringing up thence the pearls of absolute purity? You are proud of your lamp because it outshines the neighbouring candle: why not take it into the blaze of sunshine, and measure its power by the light of infinite heaven? You can then be proud of it for its own sake. By a mere standard of human comparison you may think yourself to be something when you are nothing. "Let a man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another."

It must be confessed that there is here a fine touch of Pauline irony. The irony lies specially in the word "rejoicing." When a man really proves his own work, what does he prove it to be? Dust and ashes. The most spiritual are the least self-congratulatory. It has been the universal experience of Evangelical Christendom, that those who have exhibited the highest manifestations of the Christian life have been those whose self-estimate was the lowest and the most humble. It has even not unfrequently happened that the men to whom the world pointed as the shining lights in its firmament have precisely at the moment of their shining been most doubtful of their lustre. We can find no more remarkable example of this than that of Paul himself. If there ever was a man whose life was thoroughly harmonized with the Divine life, it was the Apostle of the Gentiles; his whole being was one continuous self-surrender, and no truer epitaph could be written on his memory than those words in which he described his life-long experience: "We are alway delivered unto death." Yet this man, whose life was

so hid with Christ in God, who counted all things but loss for the excellency of Christ's glory, who esteemed all the afflictions of time to be light and momentary when weighed against the vision of union with Christ, is the man who of all others has left on record the profoundest traces of spiritual conflict. At the very moment when he is the greatest living representative of the power of Christianity, he is so unconscious of his power that we find him breaking forth almost into the utterances of despair: "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" "There is a law in my members warring against the law of my mind;" "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh;" "I am unworthy to be called an apostle;" "Oh! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" On a first view such utterances, coming from such a quarter, can be nothing but startling. They strike the superficial mind as the manifestations of a wavering confidence; they are, in truth, the evidences of a very advanced Christianity. The more spiritual a man becomes, the more he becomes subject to a very painful sense of selfcontemplation. As a man whose frame has been subjected to the ravages of a fever never fully realizes these ravages until he has reached the stage of convalescence; as a man whose mind has been sunk in ignorance never fully realizes that ignorance until he has been confronted by the lamp of knowledge; so the life which has been spent in spiritual darkness can only begin to perceive its darkness when there strikes upon its vision the first rays of morning. So far is the Buddhist from being philosophically correct in holding the goal of spirituality to be the vanquishing of individual desire, that the very converse is the philosophical truth. The goal of spirituality is the intensification of individual desire, the awakening of the individual to a deeper and a more painful apprehension of how far he has come short of the infinite glory. Saul of Tarsus, before he has seen the light, is thoroughly self-satisfied; after the straitest sect he has lived a Pharisee; touching the righteousness of the law he feels himself blameless; he has, in truth, not yet known himself. Saul of Tarsus, after he has seen the light, falls to the earth, crushed by the vision of his own individual darkness, and the more familiarized his eye becomes to the light, the more intense becomes his sense of the darkness: he finds himself in losing sight of his selfishness; and he finds himself to be sunk in the shadows of death. The most spiritual are the most self-reflective, and the self-reflection is a great pain.

3. Is there any alleviation of this pain? is there any refuge which the individual can find from the oppression of his own individuality? This is the final question suggested by the passage before us, and apparently the final question suggested in the spiritual experience of St. Paul. And he answers it by a final paradox: "Bear ye one another's burdens, for every man shall bear his own burden." The pain of self-reflection can only be removed by sympathy. "You," he says, "have a burden of your own to bear, and a burden which by no possibility can be transferred to another—the burden of individual responsibility. There is a very solemn sense in which you are alone in the universe. You carry about within you something which marks you off from all mankind, which you must bear through life and through death, which no surrounding multitude

can hide, and which no brotherly affection can lighten: it is the weight of having a responsible soul. Beneath that weight you may at times be crushed, and may be disposed to sink under your burden. At such times there remains but one refuge. Remember that the same solemn burden is borne by every man. Try to enter into sympathy with that sense of individual responsibility which is pressing on the lives of those around you. Your personal feeling of that pressure should serve as a gate to your sympathy. Should you succeed in realizing this common care of humanity, should you succeed in entering into sympathy with the moral burden of your brother man, the moral burden of your individual life will in that moment fall from you; in the very act of realizing the bitterness of universal pain, the sting of individual sorrow will cease to wound." Such is the thought in the mind of the Gentile Apostle, and its application to religious life needs no comment. A thousand times, in periods of religious revival or in seasons of mental depression, we are confronted by men professing to have lost sight of the shore to which they steered. They believed themselves to be united to Christ, but a cloud has hid from them the object of their faith. They ask for an evidence of their own steadfastness, for a personal test by which they shall know that they are not castaways; if possible, for a revivifying of that feeling which once constituted their joy. The answer of St. Paul to such is the answer he gave to his own misgivings, and practically the same answer which the Founder of Christianity gave to the misgivings of his earliest followers—the exhortation to work. "If any man shall do the will, he shall know of the doctrine," is the sublime direction of the Master

into the way of personal conviction. It is only another way of saying that faith without works is dead, that the service of humanity in the life of action is necessary to give value to the life of contemplation. And so, taking up the refrain, the Apostle of the Gentiles declares that the soul can only learn its riches in the act of expending them. To the man who has lost the freshness of his first personal convictions, and who is oppressed with the load of his inevitable burden, he suggests the remembrance that the burden is inevitable for all. He bids him forget his individual discomfort, in so far as his discomfort is only individual; he bids him remember his individual pain, in so far as that pain is the heritage of universal humanity. "Bear others' burdens," he says, "and you shall bear your own. Feel your inevitable union with the race, and your inevitable individual sorrow will cease to be intolerable. Make the realization of your own responsibility the starting - point of your sympathy with the personal and untransferable struggles of each individual soul, and in the process the struggle of your own soul shall lose its torment, and the weight of your own burden shall lose its pain. Without diminishing its actual quantity, it shall cease to be a load when it is lifted by the arm of love. Taking upon you the Master's yoke of humanity, every other yoke shall become easy. You will get back the personal peace when it ceases to be sought for purely personal ends. 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and every man shall bear his own burden,' without an exhaustive effort or an overmastering pain." GEORGE MATHESON

THE BOOK OF JOB.

VII. THE INTERVENTION OF ELIHU.

(CHAPTERS XXXII.-XXXVII.)

WE are arrested on the very threshold of this section of the Book. Before we can enter upon it we must, for no choice is allowed us, raise and determine the question: Is the intervention of Elihu an integral part of the original Poem, or is it only a late, spurious, and worthless addition to it by some unknown hand? From the very first, Commentators have been very hard on Elihu. Ancient Jewish rabbis pronounced him "Balaam in disguise." Many fathers, both of the Eastern and of the Western Churches, held him up to scorn as a type of the false wisdom, the broken and misleading lights, of heathen philosophy. By modern Commentators he has been stigmatized as "a pert braggart boy" of "weak rambling speech," "a mere shadow" (Herder), "a babbler" (Umbreit), "a most conceited and arrogant young man" (Hahn): Merx, indeed, carries his contempt for Elihu so far as altogether to ignore, if not to annihilate, him, by leaving his orations wholly untouched, although they are to be found in every MS. of Job which we possess.

On the other hand, one of the most recent translators of the Book (Coleman, 1869), on the express ground that Elihu's language would be unbecoming in a mere mortal, that it is too wise and too authoritative for merely human lips, actually affirms him to be no less than "the Second Person of the Sacred Trinity," and with a sublime audacity translates the Hebrew for "Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the tribe of

Ram," by, "Elihu, the blessed Son of God, the Despised

One, of the lineage of the Most High"!

More sober judges than these have their doubts of Elihu; they question whether the speeches attributed to him can fairly be regarded as part of the original Poem, and lean to the conclusion that they were inserted either by the Poet himself at some subsequent revision of his work, or by some later and inferior hand.

These doubts, like the adverse conclusions of the "higher criticism," are based on the following considerations. (1) That Aramaic forms of speech abound in this section of the Poem to a very unusual degree. (2) That at least the boastful exordium (Chaps. xxxii. 6-xxxiii. 7) to Elihu's "discourse" is wholly out of keeping with the Poet's manner and style. (3) That the part played by Elihu is not essential to the drama; that even when he breaks into his "discourse" he contributes nothing of any value to the argument of the Poem: so that both the man himself and his orations might be detached from it without any sensible loss, or even with obvious and positive gain.

Now, I am not of those who "deny the value of criticism, and refuse to accept the evidence of partial compilation and redaction patent in the Biblical texts;" but surely the evidence should be both "patent" and conclusive before we are summoned to yield to it. And I submit that the presumption is in favour of the text as settled by a careful collation of the MSS., and even in favour of the traditional interpretation of the text. Before we advocate any change on the sole evidence of internal criticism or evidence, it would only be fair to study the passage in question with a view to

ascertain whether, as it stands, it does not fall in, if not with our modern canons of art, yet with the design and the art canons of the Oriental poet or prophet to whom, on sufficient diplomatic evidence, it has been attributed from the earliest recoverable date. And if this course had been taken, if these Chapters had been approached with a prejudice in favour of the original text as established by external evidence, instead of a prejudice in favour of change; if, in short, the destructive critics had not shewn "that irritable kind of intellect," common to their school, "which sets an undue value on novel theories and novel interpretations," it may be doubted whether they would have found much weight in the arguments that have led them to ascribe the intervention of Elihu to a later hand, or to denounce it as a fraudulent and irrelevant interpolation. For myself, I confess that, as I approached this section of the Poem, I quite expected, so high and numerous are the authorities who have impugned it, to be convinced that it was at least a later addition to it, inserted either by the original author himself, or by some other poet who was moved by one and the selfsame Spirit; and it is with no small surprise that I have been led by a patient study of it, and after careful consideration of the objections alleged against it, to conclude that these objections carry very little weight, and that the discourses of Elihu form an integral part of the original work. To be quite frank, it is with a certain regret, as well as surprise, that I have reached this conclusion; for it imposes on me the difficult and unwelcome task of vindicating it: and I cannot but be conscious that I lay myself open to the charge of arrogance and presumption in contesting the verdict of critics many

PACIFIC SCHOOL

of whom are so much more able and learned than myself. Every man, however, like each of the Evangelists, is bound to speak the truth "according to" him: and therefore I submit for consideration the following answers to the objections most commonly alleged against Elihu, and the part he plays, and the words he speaks.

I. That Aramaisms should abound in his "discourse," so far from being an argument against its genuineness and authenticity, becomes an argument in its favour the moment we observe that Elihu is introduced to us as an Aramæan Arab: for who should use Aramæan words and idioms if not the one speaker in the Poem who is of Aramæan blood? That the style of this Section differs largely from that of other sections of the Poem, and is in some ways inferior to it, is, or may be, conceded: but how long has it been an offence against dramatic art that the diction of an actor and speaker should correspond to his age, and position, and race? Good critics, such as Ewald, Schlottmann, and Davidson, find fine distinctions of idiom and style, a characteristic tone, in the speeches of each of the three Friends—all old or elderly men, and all more or less closely akin. Might we not fairly expect, then, to find on the lips of a young man, and a young man of different type and blood, a still larger and more characteristic deviation from the common standard of language and manner? Are we to admire the Author for the delicate discrimination which leads him to put characteristic language into the lips of the Friends, and to blame him, or even to deny his hand, when he puts language equally characteristic and appropriate into the mouth of Elihu? Whatever "the higher criticism" has attempted, or may attempt, on *Henry V.*, it would be hard to persuade Englishmen that Fluellen was not created by the same capacious mind which gave birth to the King himself and his statesmen and captains, albeit "the care and valour of this Welshman was a little out of the fashion" of the time, and Shakespeare endeavours—not with complete success, be it said with reverence—to give him the mental and verbal idioms, and even the very pronunciation, peculiar to the English-speaking Welsh.¹

2. So, too, with the boastful exordium to Elihu's discourse, which seems most of all to have stirred the bile of the critics, which has led them to stigmatize him as a "braggart boy," and to doom him to something very like capital punishment, it may be well to ask, before we consent to that doom, whether in his conditions such an exordium might not be natural and consistent. Far too much stress has been laid on this point. Elihu is not guilty, as I hope to shew in detail when we study his orations verse by verse, of a tithe of the conceit and self-commendation which has been attributed to him. He is far indeed from being the vulgar and fluent "braggart" he has been painted. But, granting to the full all that has been alleged against him, I would still submit that he does but carry himself in a manner characteristic of his race. If travellers are to be believed, the boastful and long-

² Even Prince Hal himself speaks a very different language, and takes a very different tone, when rioting with his boon companions to that which he employs when, having "turned away his former self," he resumes his majesty and "shews his sail of greatness" as he discusses affairs of state with his nobles and prelates. And I do not yet despair of seeing some grave German critic of the "higher" school contrasting the style and idioms of the two so-different series of scenes, and authoritatively assigning the Falstaff scenes to the third or fourth redacteur of the Plays.

winded accost so repulsive to the English mind is common to many Oriental races, and may be heard to this day when Arab meets Arab in the Desert. So, also, I have somewhere read, though I cannot now recover the reference, that in their modern dramas and rhapsodies characters continually introduce themselves to the audience with a boastful recital of their claims to attention similar to the opening sentences of Elihu's discourse. Nor is this custom confined to the illiterate to the wandering and fighting clans and to the rhapsodists who amuse their leisure. Boasts far more turgid than those attributed to Elihu may be encountered in the writings of grave Arabian historians and poets. We have a capital illustration of this singular habit in the celebrated Arab historian of the seventeenth century, Al-Makkari-or, to give him his full style, Ahmed Ibn-Mohammed Al-Makkari Attelemsari-known in the East as "the Western Traditionist and Bright Star of Religion." In the preface to his curious and erudite "History of the Mohammedan Dynasties of Spain," he thus describes his labours in behalf of a grateful and admiring posterity: "We had, while residing in the West laboured hard on the history of Andalus; we had collected for the description of that country and its inhabitants the most interesting and valuable documents, and the most complete written as well as oral information. We had described minutely the aptitude and superiority of the Andalusians in the sciences, their forwardness and courage in attacking the cruel enemy of God; the enchanting beauty of the spots they formerly inhabited, the sites of their contests and battles; of all which we had amassed treasures enough to satisfy the

wishes and ambition of the most excellent historian, and collected a sufficient number of unique pearls to bewitch the mind of the reader, and gathered in the delightful paths of their literature flowers enough to gratify the senses of the studious, and strung together many useful and hitherto unknown things in a manner to make the eyes of the learned and ingenious start out of their orbits with pleasure and astonishment. All this, moreover, was written in such an elevated and flowing style that, had it been delivered by the common crier, it would have made even the stones deaf." If this stately and highflown vaunt be, as it is, characteristic of Arab literature from the earliest times—though I confess this to be the most delicious instance of it I have ever met-we need not be surprised to find some touch of it in the opening sentences of Elihu. No picture of Arab life would be complete without it. To blot it out of the Poem would be to remove one of its most effective patches of "local colour." Some touches of it we have met already—in Chapter xiii. 1-22, for example, in the elaborate preface to Job's memorable Declaration or Defence (Chaps. xiii. 23 xiv. 22), and even—though here in a much softened and half-concealed form in Chapters xxix. and xxxi.: it simply culminates in Chapters xxxii. and xxxiii.

3. To this general defence of Elihu's exordium, so immodest to many critics, and yet to an Oriental ear suggestive of modesty, as implying that the speaker is fain to prove himself not altogether unworthy of the company into which he thrusts himself, I would add the following considerations:—

(a) Elihu was a young man; and youth is commonly positive, dogmatic, impatient.

(β) If Elihu was, as there seems reason to believe, a modest young man, impelled and constrained by the ardour of his convictions and emotions to thrust himself into an argument conducted by his elders, constrained even to rebuke and correct men venerable for wisdom as well as for age, like most modest and sensitive young men in that case, he would be likely to break through the restraints of youth and reverence with an effort, a rush, which would carry him to the opposite extreme—his very modesty making him seem immodest, his very reverence irreverent.

 (γ) In the first five Verses of Chapter xxxii. we are told no less than four times that Elihu's "anger was kindled." We may therefore fairly assume that he began to speak in a white heat of passion and excitement. Hence he would naturally speak with a vehemence and impetuosity which would throw the more turbid elements of his nature to the surface; while, as his excitement found vent in speech, his spirit would calm down, and he would rise into a sobriety and elevation of thought in happy contrast to his opening words.

(δ) It was, as we shall see, a *new* thought which he had to utter—new to him himself perhaps, certainly new to the old men to whom he addressed himself; and these were men to whom that which was new and strange was also questionable, heretical, and even damnable; so that, bold as he was, Elihu hardly "durst shew them his conviction" (Chap. xxxii. 6): and what

is more excited and boastful than fear?

(ε) To all this I may still add that, on my own mind, this much-incriminated exordium of Elihu's leaves the impression that it is little more, after all, than a string

of scholastic formulæ, sentences which were the current coin of debate, mere "common forms" of speech, the ancient Oriental analogues of the logical and rhetorical forms which were familiar in the Schools of Europe during the Middle Ages. Of course it is quite impossible to prove the accuracy of such an impression, —Delitzsch, however, shews that he shares it when he affirms that Elihu "speaks more in the tone of scholastic controversy" than any of the other combatants in this logical fray; and therefore I can only suggest it for consideration, since we have no extra-Biblical specimens of the Arab literature of that distant age. But every civilized race has, or has had, these common forms of debate, and even some uncivilized races: the Zulus, for example, are said to excel in debate, and to have attained an art and skill in oratory which it would tax all the resources of an English barrister or statesman to encounter. Such forms are a great resource for unfledged orators; and as a rule, I think, they are more generally used in the opening sentences of an oration, until the speaker warms to his work. Hence, to me, Elihu shapes himself as a young scholarly Arab, flourishing his controversial weapons, and something too conscious of their play and glitter, until he forgets all about them in the gathering heat of thought and emotion.

4. The most fatal objection to him, if it were true, or even if it could be plausibly sustained, would be that he is superfluous; that he adds nothing to the argument of the Poem; that his intervention only arrests the progress of the Drama and is utterly out of keeping with it; that it would gain much if he and his part were clean cut out of it. Against this cruel and formidable objection I would plead—

(a) That Elihu represents the audience, the circle of interested bystanders on the *mezbele*, whom, absorbed in the argument, we are apt to forget, despite Job's occasional allusions to them, and the indirect ad captandum appeals of the Friends to their convictions and prejudices. And what should persuade us of their presence, and of their profound interest in every turn of this great controversy, if not the fact that one of them, when the Friends are put to silence, can no longer contain himself, *must* speak that he may get him ease (Chap. xxxii. 19, 20), and eagerly presses forward that he may take part in the affray?

 (β) Elihu also represents the rising thought of the young men of the tribes, who seem to have lost faith in the accepted dogma, that sin and suffering were strict correlatives, before their elders had emancipated themselves from it; and thus supplies a very genuine and valuable addition both to the argument and to the

dramatic action of the Poem.

(γ) He delivers the human verdict on the Controversy between Job and the Friends, which we want to hear almost as much as the Divine verdict; saying, in effect, what the Commentators have been saying ever since, that both were wrong, that a higher solution of the problem than they had attained was both requisite and attainable, and indicating the direction in which it was to be found.

(8) For what he really contributes to the main argument of the Book is that suffering may be medicinal, corrective, fructifying, as well as punitive. The Friends had proceeded on the assumption, an assumption abundantly refuted by Job, that his calamities sprang, and could only spring, from his transgressions. In

their theology there was no room for any other conclusion. But, obviously, there is another interpretation of the function of adversity which needs to be discussed, if the discussion is to be complete; and this wider interpretation Elihu seeks to formulate. According to him, God may be moved to chastise men by love as well as by anger; with a view to quicken their conscience, to instruct their thoughts and give them a larger scope; in order to purge them, that they may bring forth more or better fruit; to rouse them from the lethargy into which, even when they are spiritually alive, they are apt to sink, and to save them from the corruption too often bred even by good customs, if these customs do not grow and change. His main contention has indeed, since his time, become the merest commonplace: we find, and adopt, it in many forms, and are for ever pleading that

> Heaven is not angry when He strikes, But most chastises those whom most He likes;

or arguing that

There is some soul of goodness in things evil, Would men observingly distil it out;

or admiring the gracious Providence which raises and purifies men by their very losses and pains,

From seeming evil still educing good.

But this pious commonplace was sufficiently new to Job and his Friends to be startling. It had not occurred to them, or had only occurred to them. It finds no place, or no adequate place, in their controversy; it was not really woven into their argument, though it had been glanced at occasionally by this speaker or that,—after the manner of our Poet, who

often sends hints to run before and prepare the way of themes which he afterwards elaborately develops and embellishes. To them, Elihu, when he contends that God often delivers the afflicted by and through their afflictions, must have seemed to be either uttering a dangerous heresy, or speaking as one who had received

new light and inspiration from on high.

(e) But besides this new and surprising truth, which has become a truism, Elihu adds much to the main argument of the Poem, and connects his contribution with that argument in so many ways as to render it probable almost to demonstration that his intervention was part of the original plan of the work. It is not only that this section is attached by many threads of thought and expression to the other sections of the Poem, threads too minute and subtle to have been inserted by any later hand. Nor is it only that the fine description of a thunderstorm with which the final oration concludes (Chaps. xxxvi. 26-xxxvii. 24) most fitly and nobly introduces the Theophany which closes the Book, depicting the "tempest" out of which Jehovah speaks. But, as Professor Davidson has pointed out, the contention of Elihu meets, and refutes, the main positions taken up by Job. To the very end (Chap. xxxi. 35-37) Job had demanded audience of God, implying or affirming that he cried out for Him in vain (Chap. xxx. 20-24). Throughout his argument, and still to the very end, he had impugned the justice of God and of his rule over men. And even in his Soliloquy he had asserted the mystery of Providence, and the impossibility of apprehending or vindicating it (Chap. xxviii.). These, indeed, are his main positions; and Elihu assails, and carries, them all.

To his contention that God would not speak to men, Elihu replies that God docs speak to men in many ways-instructing them by dreams, reproving and correcting them by the natural and inevitable results of their own actions, in order that by both these-by experience and by quickened and suggestive ideals-He may redeem their souls and bring them back to the light of life (Chap. xxxiii. 14-30). To his contention that God was unjust, since the righteous man was none the better tor his righteousness, Elihu replies that the very creation and continuance of the world prove God to be good; that He who has the whole universe in charge cannot be inequitable (Chap. xxxiv. 10-15); that the Ruler of the world must be just, since injustice means anarchy, and anarchy dissolution (Chap. xxxiv. 16-30); that, so far from men gaining nothing by their righteousness, their courses of action, whether good or evil, must tell upon their own character and conditions, since they cannot affect Him who sits above the clouds (Chap. xxxv. 2 8); and that, when they cry out in vain under their calamities and oppressions, it is because they cry amiss-from mere fear and pain, not from love of righteousness and trust in God their Maker (Chap. xxxv. 9 16). To his contention that the Divine Providence is an inscrutable mystery, Elihu, without for a moment assuming to solve the whole mystery of Providence, replies that the very sufferings of which Job complains open the eyes and hearts of men to a perception of the meaning and design of Providence sufficient for all practical, i.e., all moral, purposes, teaching them their sinfulness and God's goodness, and that the whole course of his Providential rule takes its colour from the strife between these two (Chaps, xxxvi. and

xxxvii.). "And while he is descanting on the greatness of God, which is but the other side of his goodness, displayed in the storm-cloud that he sees rising, suddenly he is interrupted, and God Himself speaks out of the storm."

Let these considerations be but fairly weighed, and the candid student will at least hesitate before he consents to cut out Elihu's part from this noble drama, at the bidding of critics who seem transported beyond all bounds of reason and patience by the mere mention of his name. Whatever else he may be, Elihu is no "bombastic braggart," or "chattering trifler," or "conceited coxcomb," who darkens counsel with words devoid of wisdom. To any one who has honestly and carefully studied his argument, it can hardly fail to appear that the critics who denounce him in such terms as these misconceive him as completely and sinistrously as Job himself was misconceived by the Friends; and it would be no great marvel should some of their ugly epithets come home to roost.

Among the objections which an adverse and too peremptory criticism has accumulated against this section of the Poem, one of the slenderest and weakest—though much stress has been laid upon it—is that Elihu does not appear either in the Prologue or in the Epilogue; that he is not so much as introduced to us until the Poem is drawing to a close. But unless we are to evolve the scheme of an antique Oriental poem out of our own consciousness, or demand that it should conform to our own arbitrary canons of art, instead of carefully studying the Poem to ascertain on what scheme it was actually modelled, such an objection

proves nothing but a determination to make the faults it cannot find. It is a sufficient reply to the objection, that Elihu is introduced to us, and even formally and elaborately introduced, as soon as he comes forward, as soon, i.e., as we need to know him. The Friends were not introduced to us till they were wanted, till the action of the Drama compelled the Poet to make them known to us; and even then they were not introduced so formally as Elihu, nor at such length. Elihu is not in the Prologue because he is not to take part in the argument of the Poem till toward its close; and he is not in the Epilogue because the anger of the Lord was not kindled against him as it was against the Friends, because, so far as he went, he had spoken of God aright, while they had not.

CHAPTER XXXII. VERSES 1-6.

Chap. XXXII.—So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own eyes. (2) Then was kindled the anger of Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the tribe of Ram; against Job was his anger kindled, because he justified himself rather than God. (3) Also against his three friends was his anger kindled, because they could find no answer to Job and yet condemned him. (4) For Elihu had delayed to answer Job because they were older than he; (5) but when Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of these three men, his anger was kindled. (6) And Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, answered and said:—

From Chapter xxxii., Verse 1, we learn, as we learn more fully from Verses 15 and 16, that the Friends had ceased to argue with Job, not because he had convinced them—for, to them, he was still only "righteous in his own eyes"—but simply because they could not move him from his position; because, though their arguments had broken down, they had "no more," or no

more cogent arguments to allege. Our inference from their silence is thus confirmed and established.

Verse 2.—The word Elihu means, "My God is He;" the word Barachel, "May God bless." As proper names they imply that Elihu belonged to a family in which the great primitive tradition of one God and Lord over all was retained and accepted. The added tribal name—Buzite—indicates that Elihu was an Aramæan, since it marks descent from Nahor, Abram's brother, through Buz his son; and yet an Aramæan Arab, since Jeremiah (Chap. xxv. 23) reckons the Buzites among the Arabs proper, who were distinguished by their "shaven cheeks" or temples, z.e., who cut their hair short all round because they held, with St. Paul, that "if a man have long hair it is a shame to him." I Within the Buzite clan Elihu sprang from the family of Ram; but of this family nothing is now known, though no doubt it once helped the readers of "Job" to identify him.

Elihu, then, is somewhat more fully and precisely introduced to us than any other of the interlocutors of the Poem save Job himself; and his Aramæan descent goes far to explain the Aramaic flavour of his "discourse."

In Verses 2 and 3 we are told what it was that induced and constrained him to thrust himself into the discussion. He had observed with indignation (1) that Job had justified himself at the expense of God; and (2) that the Friends had condemned Job although they could not refute him. It was not the mere fact that

¹ Herodotus (iii. 8) describes tl e Arabs as cutting their hair à la Bacchus, and explains, "Now their practice is to cut it in a ring, away from the temples." Comp. Jer. ix. 26; xlix. 32.

Job had held fast his integrity, that he had vindicated himself against the aspersions of the Friends, which had moved Elihu to anger; but that, in order to vindicate himself and refute them, he had charged God with injustice. Nor was his anger kindled against the Friends simply because they had condemned Job; but because they had condemned him for sins of which they had no shadow of proof, and without really clearing the character of the God for whom they assumed to speak. So far, therefore, Elihu is at one with Jehovah Himself; for He too rebukes Job for so asserting his own righteousness as to condemn Him (Chap. xl. 8), and his anger is kindled against the Friends for aspersing Job to vindicate Him (Chap. xlii. 7, 8).

Full of words and arguments which he felt to be far more cogent than any they had adduced, waxing wellnigh desperate at seeing so momentous a theme so grossly mishandled, he had yet restrained himself out of deference to the age of the Friends; but now, when they have manifestly failed to solve the problem submitted to them, and even Job has nothing further to allege in his own defence, he feels that he may give vent to his repressed indignation without any lack of modesty or courtesy, and state as best he can the thoughts which have risen up within him as he has listened to their long and indecisive controversy (Verses 5, 6). Accordingly, he proceeds in four separate discourses, which yet are one discourse, to meet the arguments of Job in what he holds to be a wiser and more convincing method than that of the old men who, as all admit, had met them neither wisely nor fairly; and to prove (a) that God does speak to men in many ways, though Job had complained that He would not and did not speak (Chaps. xxxii. 6—xxxiii. 33); (β) that God is just, though Job had charged Him with injustice (Chap. xxxiv.); (γ) that the righteous man is the better for his righteousness, though Job had argued that he was not (Chap. xxxv.); and (δ) that the mystery of Providence, though it must ever remain a mystery, is not so utterly inscrutable as Job had alleged (Chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii.).

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

THE LAST WORDS OF ST. PAUL.

WHATEVER views prevail with reference to the termination of St. Paul's historic captivity in Rome, all writers who admit the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy agree that that document contains the last recorded utterance of the great Apostle. These are words dictated by him either towards the conclusion of the first and the only imprisonment, or of the second and final one, and in full view of the headsman's axe. Even Ferdinand Christian Baur, whose assault upon the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles was of prime importance to his system, in one of his later works seems to admit the possibility of the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy. I may be readily conceded that there are sundry real difficulties besetting the First Epistle, such, e.g., as the mention of ecclesiastical orders and Church organiza-

^{* &}quot;In the great sea of possibilities it may perchance be possible to find a calm spot for the Epistle to Titus and the Second to Timothy; . . . but their entire similarity to, and their intimate connection with, the First to Timothy involves them all alike in the same condemnation."—Paul, his Life and Works. By F. C. Baur. Edited by E. Zeller. Translated by Menzies. F, T. L., 1875. Vol. ii. pp. 104, 105.

tion of which we find no entirely satisfactory trace in any other book of the New Testament: references to a development of Gnostic speculation, which suggest a date later than the Asiatic ministry of St. Paul; the adoption by the writer of a style and vocabulary which unquestionably differ from those of the well-known Epistles; and, not least, the chronological perplexities which cannot easily be reconciled with the events recorded in the Acts. These difficulties, with the exception of the last, are capable of a satisfactory solution: I but our readers should remember that the Second Epistle is comparatively free from their incidence. With marked ingenuity, Wieseler has endeavoured to harmonize the references in this Epistle to the imprisonment of the author with other references to his prison life, and has urged that all difficulty consequent on the doctrinal tone of the Epistle disappears on close inspection, and after comparison with the other letters of the captive Apostle. On the other hand, it is generally conceded by conservative critics that that portion of the assault on the genuineness of these Epistles which turns on the extreme difficulty of finding the true chronological opportunity for the composition of both Epistles to Timothy during the period covered by the Acts, has been completely successful, and that the only way of apprehending the numerous references to time, place, and person, is to regard them as having opened a new page in the biography of the Apostle, one entirely untraversed by the Acts or by any other of the Epistles.

If the Second Epistle to Timothy be a genuine document it furnishes historic testimony of first-class

See THE EXPOSITOR, vol. ii.

authority to the traditional belief of the early Church concerning Paul's release from his first captivity. The renewal of his evangelistic work under altered circumstances then becomes certain, and his apprehension on a new and perilous charge historic. Moreover, this Epistle furnishes biographical detail down to the latest period of the Apostle's life. If, however, this precious document, by itself, and from its intrinsic excellence, and because of its Pauline teaching and its historic verisimilitude, can be credited to this extent, it accomplishes for us a great deal more. If St. Paul's ministry was indeed prolonged to the close of the reign of Nero, time is then left for the development of those ecclesiastical changes and doctrinal eccentricities to which reference is made in the other two Epistles. More than that, ample time is provided for the occurrence of such missionary journeys as are suggested by the First Epistle to Timothy and by the Epistle to Titus. Moreover, the linguistic difficulties are greatly diminished. Words and phrases that are peculiar to the three Pastoral Epistles mutually confirm each other, and are not more numerous than those terms or turns of expression which are peculiar respectively to the other three groups of the Pauline Epistles.

Some of our critical opponents, while they admit that if the documents were genuine, they would in themselves prove the release and the second imprisonment of St. Paul, maintain that unless their authenticity can be established on independent grounds, this very circumstance invalidates their authorship. The objection comes with rather bad grace from those who attribute no historic value to the Acts of the Apostles, and who, as in the case of Baur, reject the Pauline

authorship of the Epistles to the Philippians and the Ephesians. But it should be remembered that, granting the authenticity of Acts and Philippians, neither the one nor the other of these documents asserts, or implies, that Paul's imprisonment was terminated by his death; on the contrary, they alike suggest the hope and the prospect of acquittal.¹

The same is true of the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon.² The existence of other documents, such as the Pastoral Epistles—which demonstrate the release of Paul, and yet confirm the tradition of his cruel death-does not in the least degree clash with the existing literature, but confirms the accuracy of the hints which are suggested by it. If the Acts, the Epistles to the Philippians, or Philemon, gave us hope of deliverance; if the statements of the Acts compelled us to believe that St. Paul fell a victim to Jewish malice, that the appeal to Cæsar 3 against the bigotry of the Pharisaic party proved a failure, and that Paul fell a martyr to the cause of Christian liberty, then, however unlikely this issue would have beenconsidering the temper of the Roman courts on all such matters—the Pastoral Epistles would have challenged serious suspicion; but we may confidently assert that the earlier literature does nothing of the kind, and therefore does not, on that ground, create even a primâ facie case against the authenticity of these documents. Apart from the references furnished by the Second Epistle to Timothy, we should know no more of the termination of St. Paul's life than we do of the closing days of St. Peter, and we should have had to

Acts xxviii. 30; Phil. i. 25; ii. 24.

² Philemon 22 compared with Epistle to C clossians iv. 7-9, obviously written at the same time.

³ Acts xxv. II, I2.

depend entirely upon traditions. In this case however, certain highly respectable traditions, of which we obtain early trace, coincide in a remarkable degree with the suggestions of the Second Epistle to Timothy. Yet the relation is not so close as to justify the suspicion of adverse critics that the tradition was altogether created by the spurious document. Eusebius had too sharp a scent for supposititious works first to accept a story which had been mendaciously created by a writer in the second century for no clearly assignable reason, and then to appeal to that identical forgery in confirmation of the story.

Clemens Romanus ¹ alluded in a well-known passage to the sufferings and death of St. Paul. "After wearing," says he, "bonds seven times, after being scourged and stoned, he by reason of envy obtained the reward of patient endurance; having preached the Gospel in the East and West, he received the glorious renown due to his faith; having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the boundary of the West ($\tau \delta \tau \acute{\epsilon} \rho \mu a \tau \mathring{\eta} s \delta \acute{\nu} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$), and having borne his testimony before the governors. Thus he departed out of this world," &c.

The "boundary of the West" was a phrase used to describe the "pillars of Hercules" and the western limits of the empire.² If so, Clement sustains the

* Epistle to Corinthians, chap. v.

² Great difference of opinion has prevailed as to the precise meaning of the phrase. Lardner, vol. vi. 295; Matthies (Erklg. d. Pastoralbrief, p. 186), Baur (Tübing. Zeitschrift, 1831, iv. p. 150, and St. Paul, his Life and Works, vol. i., translated by Menzies), Davidson (Introduction to New Testament, vol. ii.) all conclude that the phrase refers to Italy or Rome; but Neander, Pearson, Guericke, Hug, Olshausen, Bishop Lightfoot (Clement, Eps. to Cor. p. 50), Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, &c., all agree that a more distant line, drawn either through the pillars of Hercules, or Britain itself, may be referred to. The Expositor, vol. i. 382.

impression that St. Paul was known to have fulfilled before his death the intention (expressed in Rom. xv. 23, 24), of continuing from Rome his missionary journey into Spain. Lardner, Tate, Davidson, and others, think that ἐλθών, "having come," rather than "having gone," is fatal to such an interpretation; and that the phrase "east and west" would not have conveyed to Corinthians the idea that Clement was writing from the meridian of Rome; further, that by the "west" he meant what was west to them, and not to him. To my mind, a writer in the metropolis of the empire would be very unlikely to project his consciousness of the relative terms "east" and "west" to the longitude of a provincial town. The geographical relation of Rome to "the whole world" would render the phrase "very hyperbolical" indeed, if Paul had never travelled or "taught righteousness" west of the port of Ostia. The use of ἐλθών, moreover, is not always limited in the strict way suggested. It is not impossible that Clement may have travelled with Paul to Spain, and, if so, remembering his own experience, he was abundantly justified in thus expressing himself.

Eusebius recognized the tradition, but does not refer to Clement, thus, according to Davidson, not accepting this translation or interpretation of his words. This is an unnecessary slur upon the report. Eusebius did not discuss the place or sphere of Paul's missionary labour. He was aware of the fact that Luke's narrative came to an end two years after the commencement of Paul's imprisonment. To account for this, he continues: "After pleading his cause, he is said to have

¹ ξρχομαί, particularly in the agrist, means to come, but there are instances to the contrary—John vi. 17; xxi. 3; Mark xi. 13; Luke ii. 44.

been sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and after a second visit to the city, that he finished his life by martyrdom." This "report" is then sustained by quotations from the Second Epistle to Timothy. Davidson suggests that these quotations shew that they were the source of the opinion, and that the confident statement above made was a mere hypothesis to explain the difficulties of the historical references in the Second Epistle. It may be said in reply that Eusebius first gives the report and then confirms it by numerous quotations, bearing on the presence or absence of Luke with the Apostle. The reference of Clement to a visit which Paul paid to Spain is very indirectly connected with the fact that "the martyrdom of the Apostle did not take place at that period of his stay at Rome when Luke wrote his history;" why, therefore, should Eusebius refer at all as he does to Clement's obscure allusion?

The text of the Muratorian fragment on the Canon is corrupt, but it does undoubtedly offer an independent support to the visit of St. Paul to Spain.² Epiphanius ³ and Jerome ⁴ refer to St. Paul's journey to Spain, although they advance no new facts.

It is perfectly true that there is not a universal acknowledgment of this tradition, and that some writers, like Pope Innocent I., are silent about it when speaking of the Apostle's end. Still, it cannot be said that independent grounds do not exist for a $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$, which in no sense contests or invalidates the Acts, or the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. There

Hist. Eccl. ii. 22.

² This is admitted by Davidson. Cf. Lewin, Life and Letters of St. Paul, vol. ii. p. 295.

⁴ De Eccl. Script., c. 5, and Comm, Amos, vol. v. pp. 8, 9.

are subtle points of difference between Clement's statement, the "report" of Eusebius, and the implications of the Second Epistle to Timothy, which, to my mind, prove that the sources of information from which Eusebius drew his λόγος were independent of both authorities. If Clement had merely meant to imply that St. Paul had reached Rome, he would not have adopted an unusual and gratuitous periphrasis. The phrase "before the governors" implies, if it does not assert, that St. Paul was not tried by the emperor in person, but by his infamous and ferocious delegates. This could not be inferred from the Epistle to Timothy, although the Epistle does not contradict it. After the fire and the consequent persecution, those who were arraigned before the imperial court, under the faintest suspicion of liability to the crimen majestatis, had no chance of ordinary justice.

Another statement occurs in the Epistle of Clement, not without bearing on the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy. "Paul," says he, "obtained the reward of patience, after wearing bonds seven times, after being scourged and stoned." St. Paul, in 2 Cor. xi. 23, ff., enumerates his varied afflictions, and declares that even at that period he had been often êv φυλακαîs. The narrative of the Acts does not specifically refer to more than one or two imprisonments, as antecedent to the composition of this letter. Clement may have added to the imprisonment in Philippi, and perhaps one at Thessalonica, those from which Paul suffered at Jerusalem, Cæsarea (Melita?), and Rome; but the explicit "seven times" suggests even then more than one imprisonment in the metropolis.

If, then, the "report" of Eusebius, and the sugges-

tion of Clement, be accepted, the Apostle was released from captivity before the fire in Rome. If the tradition of the visit to Spain covers an important chapter in his history, he fulfilled his cherished desire, and after his release in all probability returned to the East by way of Italy. If so, he must have found great changes in the imperial precincts. The fire in Rome had roused the passions of fanatics and the murderous ire of Nero. Many critics have supposed that the news of the cruel death of James the Just, and the apostacy of the Church at Jerusalem, must then have reached and troubled him. From the circle of his followers, if not from himself, the Epistle to the Hebrews was then despatched. Be that as it may, it becomes certain that, if the Pastoral Epistles be genuine, Paul then visited Crete and Ephesus, and went thence into Macedonia, leaving Titus in the former and Timothy in the latter. If he fulfilled his intention (Ep. to Philemon) of visiting Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, this is the period during which it must have been carried out. Philemon prepared him a lodging, and Archippus gave him a welcome; and, on entering Macedonia, he would renew his promised intercourse with Epaphroditus and other friends at Philippi. His visit to Ephesus would fill him with sorrow. The "grievous wolves" had made havoc of the flock. Some of his own presbyters had begun to speak perverse things; loose and wanton ways had been sheltered by the Church; slaves had claimed immunity from service, and despised their masters because they were brethren; natural magic had been conjoined with Christian ceremonies; logomachies and Jewish traditions had been disturbing the fellowship of the Church; and Paul's great heart

burned with fervent desire to expel the evils, to suggest principles and direct methods of Church discipline, to put the sexes into more Christian relations, and to provide adequately for widows who were cast on the love of Christ and his Church. It was amid these circumstances, while yet promising a second visit to Ephesus, that he wrote the first of the Pastoral Epistles. He was hoping to spend the winter at Nicopolis in Epirus; and, if he did so, he subsequently passed once more by Troas to Ephesus. Mr. Lewin conjectures a host of interesting details as to the manner and place of his arrest. All that we can gather from his last Letter is that Paul left at Troas—with a friend called Carpus, well known to Timothy and to himself-his cloak, books, and documents. Speculation has busied itself with the nature and motive of this deposit. The Letter does not solve the problem. Either for precaution, or amid the excitement of a hurried or forced departure from Troas, valuable property was deposited which at a later date he was anxious to reclaim. We learn, further, that his final departure from Timothy was distressing to them both. The tears of Timothy left a deep impression on the Apostle's mind, and brought back the thrilling memories of earlier years. Timothy, moreover, needed the stimulus of these memories, a vivid exposition of the Apostle's own example, and a careful reiteration of fundamental principles, to preserve him from temptations to laxity, and to inspire his fortitude as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

Further, the Apostle was accompanied by two, if not more, of his old friends—"Erastus of Corinth and Trophimus of Ephesus." The testimony of Trophimus, touching the original accusation which led to the

first "appeal to Cæsar," might be serviceable once more; but unfortunately Trophimus fell sick at Miletus, and Erastus remained at Corinth. Notwithstanding these losses, Tychicus may have accompanied him: Luke, Crescens, Titus, and Demas must have been in his company. But at length, with the one exception of the faithful Luke, all his companions—for sufficient or insufficient reasons—had left him, a circumstance which gave much point to his passionate desire for the solace of Timothy's society in his last sad hours.

The Epistle suggests that Paul was now arrested, not for a violation of the sanctity of the Jewish temple, but as a malefactor,² a violater of the Roman law. New edicts against the abettors of unlawful religions were being put in force by the imperial procurators. and transgressors of these edicts were being accused of complicity with the fanatics of the city of Rome.3 The consequence was that Paul's position in Rome differed widely from what it had been in the earlier imprisonment. His bonds in Christ were now far from being noised abroad through the Prætorium. His former friends in Cæsar's household were absent, silent, dead, or helpless. He had no "hired house," but was languishing in some obscure almost inaccessible dungeon. Onesiphorus had much difficulty in finding him, and incurred obloquy and scorn in the search. The household of this kindly man had transmitted a

3 "Addito majestatis crimine quod tum omnium accusationum complementum erat."—Tac. Ann. iii. 38.

The mention of Trophimus and Erastus in the Second Epistle to Timothy could not refer to their departure from him in his journey from Cæsarea to Rome, as described in Acts xxvii., and that for two reasons: first, the expressions would most inaccurately describe that journey, and secondly, Timothy, who spent much time with Paul during his first Roman imprisonment, could not possibly need the information here given.

2 Tim. ii. 9.

contribution to the Apostle's comfort, and Paul's heart had yearned over the young people to whom he now sent his dying benediction. The visit of Onesiphorus must have been short, as he, like Crescens, Tychicus, Demas, and Titus, had left him before his trial; and now that the hour of his deeper peril approached, there was not a solitary patronus, amicus, or procurator to aid his defence, or to deprecate the severity of his sentence. He stood alone before iniquitous judges to answer the first counts of the indictment laid against him. He had no counsel, no witnesses, to aid him, and was compelled to meet the cruel animosity of his old enemy, Alexander the brass-founder, who brought serious charges against him. Though he was deserted by all his Asiatic friends, he yet conducted his own cause with such ability and success that the whole court for once heard the gospel of Christ. Just as in earlier days, in presence of Agrippa, Bernice, and Festus, he found opportunity to proclaim Christ, so now he made all the Gentiles hear the story of the Cross and of the Crown. The issue of this first "apology" was that the judges acquitted him. "The Lord stood by him and strengthened him," and for the moment he was "delivered out of the mouth of the lion." Still it was a temporary respite; he was not a free man; heavier charges remained behind; and he felt that he was already being "poured out as a libation" on the great sacrifice. "The time of his dissolution was at hand." He had "run the race" with Jewish exclusiveness, with Rabbinical pride; he had run the race with imperial jealousy; he had run the race, and a hard race too, with physical infirmity, with heartless treachery and ingratitude-and he had won. He saw the "crown" and glory of the

"righteousness" of God; and it was well. Christ-like, patient, and forgiving, joyous and hopeful, he was about to place all his great deposit in the hands of Him who first entrusted to him the solemn charge. In a tone quite unlike that of the Epistle to the Philippians, this final Letter, written in the interval of the two hearings, reveals no expectation of further release, except that which would be effected by admission into the heavenly kingdom. He is, however, human, and yearns to see once more his beloved son, his "very own" Timothy. This exquisite trait of character is actually brought forward by some of the impugners of the Epistle as a sign of unworthy weakness. Paul, say they, would have been willing to die alone, and would not have whined for sympathy. On the contrary, we see no stoical repression of human tenderness in St. Paul; nor can we fail to be reminded here of Him who said to his slumbering disciples, "Could ye not watch with me one hour?" Obviously, one reason for the composition of this Epistle was his intense desire to see Timothy once more. For Timothy's sake, as well as his own, he wished for this last interview. Nothing could be more natural. visit was, indeed, one which might imperil Timothy's safety, and therefore it would demand courage and faith on his part. Timothy must be ready to suffer affliction with Paul; 1 nay more, to suffer and die with Christ.2 This simple fact is enough to explain the tone of subdued remonstrance which pervades the Epistle. Paul is arguing in anticipation of the natural timidity which he, who knew Timothy so well, foresaw would be aggravated by the summons to come to his side. With characteristic zeal he takes the last oppor-

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 3.

tunity of lavishing on his "own beloved son," a reiteration of the fundamental ideas of the gospel; a summary of the obvious duties which devolved upon him as an evangelist, and a prophetic judgment upon the moral evils which were afflicting the Asiatic Churches. These summaries of truths and evils have been regarded as suspicious. Some of the opponents of the genuineness of this and of the other two Pastoral Epistles describe them as "commonplace," "shallow teaching." It is said that neither Timothy nor Titus would have needed under the circumstances such elementary instruction as that St. Paul was "an apostle and teacher of the Gentiles." This seems to be gratuitous and arbitrary criticism. Let it be remembered that Paul's apostolate was frequently called in question, even by his own converts; and that his doctrine and commission were angrily disputed by Judaizers on the one hand and by Gentile heretics on the other. If so, it was like the veteran Apostle to reassert his conscious claim to the dignity in the very jaws of death.

Paul, say our hostile critics, would never have uttered anything so jejune as the eulogy on Holy Scripture contained in this epistle. ² But if he had been accused of insufficient respect for the Old Testament, what could be better calculated to assist Timothy to fight his battle at Ephesus or elsewhere, than the written testimony of the Apostle to the incomparable value and Divine authority of the Sacred Books? The impugners of the genuineness of the Epistle confidently affirm that the expectation of seeing Timothy and Titus very shortly, expressed in all three Letters,

¹ 2 Tim. i. 11.

precluded the necessity for the composition of any one of them. But, on that supposition, why should an ingenious forger have made such a mistake as to blend these inconsistent elements in his work? In answer to the allegation, we observe that if we suppose that the young Evangelists were eager in their request that their master should put on record for them the burden of the teaching they had often heard from his lips, we find all the explanation of this peculiarity that we need. The references to the youth of Timothy I are perfectly compatible with the relative ages of the two men. Timothy need not have been more than thirty-five years of age when the second Letter was penned. He was timid, invalided, and disposed to shrink from anxious duty. He probably needed stimulus and encouragement. He may have been peculiarly susceptible to certain influences to which Paul refers, and from which he advises him to "flee." Though he was not, strictly speaking, a youth, he may still have required a fatherly warning against some of the temptations which are the ordinary snares of youth. Paul's age may, to his own consciousness, have easily been exaggerated by his hard life, his cruel sufferings, his varied experiences, his approaching death.

"The ethical tone," says Dr. Davidson of these Epistles, "savours of a good man who does not think deeply. The pervading spirit is flat, sober, sensible, without vigour, point, depth, or spiritual righteousness. Faith is dethroned while godliness, good works, and piety take its place. It is filed off into practical precepts." And further, he avers that "the writer professed to refute false doctrine, but he does not do it;

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 22.

² Davidson's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 171.

he simply opposes to false doctrine certain vague hints of the 'form of sound words.'"

These judgments of a distinguished Biblical critic deserve serious consideration. If they were accurate delineations of the facts of the case, they would shake our confidence. The mere epithets here applied are matters of taste, and cannot be refuted. If any critic chooses to assert that Milton is wordy, Shakespeare cloudy, and Wordsworth feeble, in style or thought, we cannot answer such vague accusations. Each reader must judge for himself whether productions which have secured an almost universal homage deserve such characterization. Now, from Chrysostom and the Apostolic Constitutions down to Calvin, Bengel, Wesley, and Mack, a very different judgment has prevailed concerning the force, suggestiveness, and practical power of these Epistles. No authentic Epistles of Paul have been more frequently or more lovingly quoted than the promises, summaries, and appeals which abound in them. "Stale," "flat," "common-place," and the like, are strange epithets to apply to the profound theological suggestions of all these Epistles, to the estimates of complicated forms of error and vice which they contain, to the "faithful sayings" which sparkle like the jewelry of heaven amid these golden sentences, and to the almost unique exhibition of the spirit in which a Christian saint can face and conquer death. More than this, the prominence given to "faith" in all St. Paul's Epistles is conspicuous in the three Pastorals. Thus, in the starting-place," "love" is based on "faith," and faith is the characteristic and appropriation of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Chap. i. 14-16, 19; and Chap. ii. 4);

"recognition of the truth" is only a fuller expression of the nature of faith: while in Chapter ii. 15 there is a new and striking exhibition of the mystery of the incarnation when accepted in faith and love.

The doctrinal passages in the Epistle to Titus are intensely Pauline, from the interweaving of a multitude of accessory thoughts with which the writer illustrates the main idea of salvation, first from the standpoint of practical obedience, and afterwards from that of God's grace. In the Epistle now under consideration, Timothy's "unfeigned faith" fills the dying Apostle's heart with joy and his eyes with tears; and faith in Christ's own work is the sustaining power with which he anticipates his own dissolution. If, as Pfleiderer 2 says, "faith is occasionally represented as one of the graces of the Christian life, and not as the radix of all virtue and sole condition of justification," still to faith is assigned a position of lofty importance. The occasional adoption of the term as an integral element of moral character, in the sense of trustworthiness rather than trustfulness, is not peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, but is found in I Corinthians xiii., and in Galatians v. 22, where there is precisely the same treatment of it. "The Apostle," says Davidson, "never elsewhere associates hope with the eternal life as he does in these Epistles;" but surely Romans viii. 24; I Thessalonians i. 3; I Corinthians. xiii. 13, compared with Titus ii. 2, iii. 5, are mutually confirmatory of their common authorship. Even the doctrine of the universality of divine favour, irrespective of all distinctions of class, as well as the dawn of the idea of humanity, and of the divine philanthropy, have been

¹ Titus ii. 11–14; iii. 4–8.

said to savour of a time when Gnosticism had divided mankind into the "pneumatic," "psychic," and "Hylic," and when a more developed Christianity assailed it with assertions of the equality of men before God. Seeing that Jewish exclusiveness, Pharisaic guile, philosophic cynicism, and Greek self-complacency had been the evils against which Paul's whole career was a protest, no adequate reason exists for rushing on to the second century in order to find occasions for such teaching. These divine words forewarn and forearm the reader against Gnostic speculations and pretensions, but they do the like for the class-spirit of feudalism, for the assumptions of mediæval mystics, of modern sacerdotalists, and hyper-Calvinists. Arguments similar to these might easily be advanced to shew that the Epistles must have been written in the tenth, the fourteenth, or the nineteenth century. Dr. Davidson's statement that the writer does not refute the false doctrines or conduct which he condemns can hardly be sustained in face of such arguments as follow: (1) those which relate to the use and abuse of the law in r Timothy i.; (2) the appeal to first principles in giving the advice concerning prayer in Chapter ii.; (3) the manner in which the beauty of Christian profession and service are illustrated in a long, continuous, compacted argument in the Second Epistle; (4) those profound principles of Christian obedience which are first based upon the eternal love and purpose of the Father, then on the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, and finally on the redemptive work of the Lord Jesus, as we find them expounded in the Epistle to Titus and the laborious and compacted arguments of the last words of the Apostle. There is special sacredness in the last words of any great teacher. A peculiar and unique value appertains to this expression of the personal faith of the great Apostle, when to all human appearance his work was a failure, when the bright sun of his hopes was setting in lurid storm-cloud, and when, amid detraction, misapprehension, desertion, and treachery, he was going into his Gethsemane, and taking up his cross.

H. R. REYNOLDS.

ZION THE SPIRITUAL METROPOLIS OF THE WORLD.

PSALM LXXXVII.

This short Psalm attracts notice by its touches of lyric beauty, as also by the exceptionally enigmatical character of its style. The last sentence contains a fine sentiment most poetically expressed, and throughout the sacred ode snatches of sweet melody fall on the ear. Yet we are puzzled at first to know what it is all about, and fail to recognize the connection of thought which gives unity to the whole. The mere English reader, ignorant of Hebrew, and conversant only with the Authorized Version, is at a special disadvantage; for our translators have been almost as unhappy in their rendering of this Psalm as in many of the most striking passages in the Book of Job. Perplexed, apparently, by the obscurity created by a bold abrupt style, in which thoughts superficially unconnected are hastily hinted at in pregnant suggestive phrases rather than fully expressed, the authors of our English Version have given us a translation which is, in some places, almost meaningless and unintelligible. Even

after critical acumen and scholarship have done their best, obscurities and disputable points remain. But one who has access to the helps supplied by the labours of learned interpreters is in a very different position from the ordinary reader for the right understanding of the Psalm. Taking up any of the critical commentaries that of Delitzsch, Ewald, Hupfeld, or Perowne: it matters not which, for modern scholars are in the main at one in their interpretation - he finds the Psalm becomes brightly luminous with one great and glorious thought, which may be expressed in the words, Zion the spiritual metropolis of the world. Thus viewed, the Psalm is seen to be a veritable light shining in a dark place, long before the dawn of the gospel day; a striking anticipation of the grand programme of St. Paul-Christ's gospel, a gospel for all the world, and for all the world on equal terms. Not that we find in it the full daylight of the era of the better hope. Here is nothing more than a tiny lamp shining in the night, lighting sufficiently a small space—the minds of the writer and of the few in Israel who shared his hope. Christian universalism and the new birth are here, but in Old Testament forms, suited to the stage in the onward progress of revelation to which the Psalm belongs. A world-wide Divine kingdom is foreshadowed, but not in the form suggested by the words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria. Zion, in Christ's picture, disappears, and Jerusalem and Israel are nothing more than any other city or people. Here Zion is the centre of the world, and all the people of the earth flow to her, to enrol themselves among her citizens. And the new birth of this Psalm is not the purely spiritual experience referred to in the discourse

of our Lord to Nicodemus. It is a politico-moral regeneration: it consists in becoming citizens of the kingdom over which God rules in Israel, and results in the vast extension of an already existing national commonwealth.

That this is the general drift of the Psalm will be evident from the following version, which, apart from details, indicates the concurrent opinion of modern scholars as to its meaning. The points on which divergent views are entertained will be indicated as we proceed.

I. His (God's) foundation is in the holy mountains.

2. Jehovah loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.

3. Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God.

[Then follows the sum of the glorious things spoken, God Himself being

the Speaker.]

4. I will proclaim Rahab (i.e., Egypt) and Babylon as being among them that know me. Behold, Philistia, and Tyre, and Ethiopia, this (that is, each of these) is born there (in Zion).

5. And concerning Zion it shall be said:

Man upon man (that is, a multitude of men) is born in her, And the Highest himself shall establish her.

Jehovah shall count, when he reckoneth up the people, This (and this, and this) is born there.

And singing, and dancing likewise (they shall say):
 All my springs are in thee.

Let us now try to elucidate this choice lyric. And first, a word on the Superscription. The Psalm is dedicated to the Sons of Korah. The Superscription forms, of course, no part of the original writing; and what is meant by inscribing a Psalm to the sons of Korah, or to Asaph, or to Jeduthun, is by no means clear. We know that the singers of each of the three Levitical families had a head, or leader of song, belonging to the same tribe and family with themselves, and that in David's day the names of

such leaders were Heman, descended from Kohath through Korah, Asaph, descended from Gershom, and Jeduthun, descended from Merari, and that the three divisions of the Levitical musicians were in all subsequent time called after the names of these men. We can easily understand how compilers of Psalms might attach to such compositions the names which had become the traditional representatives of the service of song. But why certain Psalms should be called Psalms of Asaph, and others Psalms of Heman or of the sons of Korah, and a third group Psalms of Jeduthun, we can only conjecture. It is, however, natural to suppose that the character and contents of the Psalm had some influence on the dedication. Looking at the Psalms which bear these names respectively, we find not a little to support this view. The Psalms of Asaph (the 50th, and from the 73rd to the 83rd, with the exception of the 77th) are all of a sombre tragic nature. They treat of the national life of Israel in its present low condition as contrasted with its past glory, and resemble those parts of the prophetic writings of which the purpose is to denounce prevalent iniquity. The Psalms dedicated to Jeduthun are so few as scarcely to supply a basis for inference; but the three which bear that name (the 39th, the 62nd, and the 77th) have all one character. They are Psalms of individual life, somewhat sad in tone, yet not without gleams of faith and hope to alleviate the gloom. As for the Psalms for the sons of Korah, there can be no dubiety as to their general character. With exception, perhaps, of the 42nd, 43rd, 44th, and 88th, they are not only remarkable for their lyric beauty and rich poetic feeling and diction, but also for their cheerfulness. They

are composed, so to speak, in major keys, and breathe the spirit of hope and joy. The 45th Psalm is devoted to the praise of the fairest of the sons of men; the 46th sings of the river which gladdens the city of God; the 47th celebrates the universal sovereignty of Zion's King; the 48th proclaims the unrivalled beauty of the city of the great King; the 49th expresses faith in a life for the good beyond the grave; the 84th describes, in pathetic strains, the felicity of those who enjoy abiding fellowship with God; the 85th presents a beautiful picture of a national prosperity, in which mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other. All these Psalms belonging to the Korah group have a certain common character. They celebrate the glory of Israel and her king, and capital and temple, and the privileges of those who have the happiness to belong to the chosen race; and some of them foretell more glorious days to come, when an ideally perfect King shall reign in righteousness, and when Jerusalem shall be the capital, not only of Judah, but of the whole earth. In this respect they resemble, and may be compared with, those portions of the prophetic writings which, turning away from the sorrowful present, depict, in impassioned language, the good time coming. Thus the very title of our Psalm, ascertained by induction to have a certain significance, prepares us to find in it not only a buoyant joyous tone, but a catholic spirit, in harmony with the most humane and generous utterances of Hebrew prophecy.

And this is just what we do find. The Psalm, indeed, begins with an irrepressible boasting in God as the God of Zion and of Israel, his chosen people. It declares that God hath in Zion a dwelling-place, whose

foundation is laid among the holy mountains which surround Jerusalem.1 And it represents Jehovah as well pleased with his chosen abode. "The Lord," it is written, "loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob;" and it is implied that He loves the dwellings of Jacob more than the rest of the world. But while the Psalmist makes his boast in God as the God of Israel, and more especially as the God of Zion, he does so in no exclusive narrow spirit. He is not one who wishes the chosen race to have a monopoly of Divine favour, or who, in the pride of national exclusiveness, looks down on all other nations with contempt, or who thinks that the God of Zion cares nothing for the outside world of the Gentiles. He evidently understands that Abraham and Israel were chosen to be eventually a blessing to the human race; he believes that God is King of all the earth, as well as of Judah; and he expects the advent of a time when all peoples shall know and confess Jehovah as the only true God. Far from grudging the outlying nations participation in Israel's privileges, he thinks that Israel's destiny will not be fulfilled until the partition walls shall have been thrown down, and Jews and Gentiles shall have become members of the same Divine commonwealth. He is not insensible to the present glory of Israel as the chosen inheritance and earthly home of Jehovah; but he feels that the glory of Israel while separated from the world is not to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed when Israel shall lose her separateness in one grand uni-

Ewald thinks that the present beginning is too abrupt even for this "most winged" Psalm, and that a half verse has fallen out of the text through error of the copyists, and that the original text stood somewhat as follows: "Zion is Jehovah's city, founded on the holy mountains."—V. Die Psalmen.

versal kingdom of God. Therefore he goes on to exclaim, "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God:" meaning, more glorious than I have yet spoken; such things as are written in Isaiah, where it is said to and of the chosen people: "The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Then shalt thou see, and flow together, and thine heart shall throb and swell, because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee." 2 The glorious things referred to are not victories by force of arms, but the higher glory of a moral conquest won by Israel over heathendom, as a missionary nation called to teach the Gentiles the true religion, and to win for herself imperishable renown by presenting to the world a true and worthy idea of the Divine Being.

These and other glorious things spoken of or to the city of God by the mouths of the prophets are summarized in the sequel of the Psalm, especially in the fourth Verse. God Himself speaks here, saying: "I will proclaim Rahab and Babel as among those who know me. Behold Philistia and Tyre, with Ethiopia, each of these is born there." This is a prophecy of a time when all the surrounding nations shall become converted to the worship of the true God, the God of Israel. The catalogue of nations is not exhaustive; in other prophecies of similar import other peoples are mentioned. In the splendid prophecy of the Sixtieth Chapter of Isaiah, already quoted, Midian, Ephah, Sheba, Kedar, Ne-

¹ Chapter lx. 3-5.

² In making reference to this passage I do not mean to pronounce dogmatically on the date of our Psalm. On this point the learned differ. Delitzsch thinks it belongs to the time of Hezekiah; Ewald (Calvin also) thinks it is a post-captivity Psalm. Perowne says that the decision of the question depends on one's views concerning the authorship and date of the latter portion of the Book of Isaiah.

baioth, the islands of the Mediterranean, and even Tarshish, or Spain, are represented as bringing presents and offering gifts and contributing citizens to the city of the Lord in the glorious latter days. The prophet, seeing in vision ships with their white sails rising into view on the western horizon, asks: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" and then answers his own question thus: "Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee." The range of prophetic vision is thus much wider in the passage of Isaiah than in our Psalm, embracing not only Asia and Africa, but Europe also, within its sweep. But though the catalogue of converted lands in this Psalm is far from exhaustive, it is, we think, so constructed as to have a representative character. In making this statement, we have no intention of pronouncing dogmatically on the general question how far we are entitled to treat specific references to particular peoples in prophetic descriptions of the future as merely figurative language, used by the prophet with the conscious purpose of expressing thereby in concrete form certain spiritual truths or ideas. There are, it is well known, two schools of interpreters, holding very diverse opinions on this topic, as on many others connected with prophecy. There is the school of which Hengstenberg may be taken as the representative, whose theory is that revelations were made to the prophet when he was in a state of ecstasy; that he saw the future in a vision; that in vision he saw events of the remote future as

well as of the near future, but without any perspective indicating distance; that the historical colouring drawn from present conditions was mere colouring, only figurative language, understood by the prophet to be of no intrinsic value, so that the sense which results after the colour has been rubbed off is the true meaning of the prophecy and of the prophet; and, finally, that while it was possible for any one prophet to see in vision the full picture of the future, each prophet described only a part, so that the total picture is to be got by piecing together all the separate parts. In opposition to this plausible and ingenious theory of prophetic revelation, it is contended by another school, represented by such writers as Riehm and Bertheau, that ecstasy was not the only or the usual condition of the prophet when he received revelations; that a vision was not the principal form under which he received revelations; that the prophet's view was restricted to the near future, and that he expected the speedy accomplishment of his prophecy, while remaining ignorant of the day and hour; that the terms in which he described the future were not regarded by him as mere colouring, to be brushed off in order to get at the essential elementfor example, when he prophesied the conversion of Egypt and Babylon to the worship of Israel's God, he really expected that literally to happen; and, finally, that the successive representations of the future given by different prophets were not fragments of one picture, which, being put together, would give a complete view of the future, but were each distinct, independent, and complete pictures, not capable of being combined into one whole, or, to change the figure, were as different stages in the growth of an organism, each superseding

the one going before, and being in turn superseded by the one coming after. It is easy to see what diverse methods of treating the prophecies these two theories involve, and how necessary it is that a man should decide which of them he is to adopt before he can pronounce an opinion on many a question connected with the Biblical prophetic literature. But for our present purpose it is not necessary that we should take a side in the controversy. For even assuming the theory advocated by Riehm or Bertheau to be the more correct, it is surely not inadmissible to say that the Psalmist, while seriously expecting the conversion of the nations, was guided in his selection of the nations to be named by a desire to express certain general ideas. It is characteristic of the poetic mind to use facts as symbols of ideas. Why should the Hebrew poet be an exception in this respect?

Assuming, then, that we have before us in this Psalm not merely a definite prophecy concerning certain nations, but picture - thinking, in which these nations are used symbolically, let us see what ideas this mode of interpretation will yield. Rahab is a poetic name for Egypt, and Egypt and Babylon are mentioned first as the two great political powers in existence at the time when the Psalm was written, selected as representing the "forces of the Gentiles." Next comes Philistia, the near neighbour and inveterate restless enemy of Israel, a small power compared to the other two, but, owing to its proximity, more troublesome and dangerous. In the early centuries of Israel's history, the Philistines harassed her withan incessant border warfare; after the reign of Hezekiah, they became involved in the wars between Babylon and Egypt, the

highway between the two countries running through their territory, so that the possession of their strongholds became the turning-point of the struggle between the two great rivals for the empire of the world. In every respect, then, it was meet that Philistia should enter into the prophetic picture of the golden age to come. It was natural that it should be mentioned next to Rahab and Babel, as the bone of contention between them; and no representation of Israel's future glory could be complete which did not embrace deliverance from the enmity of this alien race, and union with them under one government and one God; or, to quote the language of another prophet, which did not represent Israel as flying upon the shoulders of the Philistines seawards. Philistia, the morally perverse, inveterately hostile, grossly idolatrous people, which seemed utterly incapable of reconciliation with the chosen race, is the type and symbol of all that is unspiritual, ungenial, passionately and habitually antagonistic to the Divine kingdom, of those in every age who, like Saul of Tarsus, are persecutors, blasphemers, and scorners of the good; her inclusion being a token that no measure of depravity shall prove too much for God's grace, and that his kingdom shall number among its citizens many patterns of extreme longsuffering.

Next comes Tyre. "Behold Tyre, this one too shall be born there." Tyre, the great emporium of trade in the Eastern world in ancient times, "situate at the entry of the sea, a merchant of the people for many isles," boasting of her beauty and wealth, and saying in the pride of her heart, "I am a god. I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas." Tyre repre-

sents trade, commerce, wealth sanctified unto the service of God, instead of being devoted merely to the purposes of gratifying appetite or promoting the comfort and glory of man. The inclusion of Tyre in the list of converted nations tells us what ought to be at least. The actual fate of Tyre was not to be converted, but to be destroyed, and so to illustrate the words. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish." Her fate reads a lesson to all great commercial nations to the effect that commerce must be a handmaid to the Divine kingdom; that permanent prosperity depends on trade being conducted in harmony with God's moral government, and in subservience to the chief end of man and the destiny of the world, which is to become the kingdom of God and of his Christ.

Last comes Ethiopia, the region of the burning tropical sun and of swarthy men, the land of the children of Ham. She too shall be born there; she too shall stretch forth her hands to God, the representative of barbarism, of uncivilized races in all ages and climes. The mention of her name here is encouragement and sanction to missions among the rudest tribes, bidding the Church cherish the cheering belief that no race of men has sunk so low that it cannot be Christianized, and that even savages and slaves can be enabled by Divine grace to walk worthy of their vocation as citizens of the Divine kingdom.

When this new birth of the nations takes place, the Divine commonwealth must experience a great increase in her citizenship. This is what is said in the fifth Verse. "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man is born in her," literally, "man and man,"

conveying the idea of a multitude. Hofmann thinks the phrase is rather intended to convey the idea of individuality, the thought resulting being: While in other lands only the whole people as a unity is taken into account, in Zion men are reckoned man by man. Delitzsch objects that the prominence which would thus be given to the value of personality is in advance of the Old Testament mode of thought; but this objection will not be sustained by those who, with Pfleiderer, hold that the achievement of the prophets was to give to Israel these three great ideas: (1) Jehovah, Israel's God, the only God; (2) Jehovah reveals Himself to the individual spirit; (3) the Messianic hope.² The last clause of this Verse, "and the Highest himself shall establish her," gives the assurance that the increase and glory of Zion will not be ephemeral. God will keep the newborn citizens by his almighty power unto salvation, so that when He writes up the people, and calls over the muster-roll, each one will be there to answer to his name, this one from Babel. that one from Egypt, and so on, till the number be complete, making up a grand total gathered together from east, west, north, and south, to sit down in the kingdom of God.

Such being the Divine care of the holy common-wealth, what is the temper of its new citizens? The last Verse of the Psalm tells us: They are proud of their citizenship. The grand distinction for them is that they are citizens of Zion. They forget their former nationality, and find in the city of God their all. Their spirit is revealed in their behaviour. They go about in the city of God singing and playing on

¹ Schriftbeweis, vol. iii. p. 526.

² Die Religion, pp. 340-350.

flutes, or better, dancing, demonstrating by song and gesture their exuberant joy on being privileged to enter into the sacred commonwealth. They deem citizenship there the summum bonum, for they say or sing, "All my springs (of joy) are in thee." So we render the words, deeming it the best of all proposed renderings, better than Ewald's, "All my arts are in thee;" I or Hofmann's, "All my sources (of children) are in thee;" 2 or Hupfeld's, based on the Septuagint, "Sing and dance all my dwellers in thee;" 3 God, in all these renderings, being supposed to be the Speaker. All my well-springs of joy are in thee, say Egypt and Babylon, who formerly gloried in their power; Philistia joins in the chorus, who formerly gloried in doing as much mischief as possible to the chosen race; Tyre also, who gloried in her merchandise; and Ethiopia, who gloried in her shame, her ignorance, barbarism, and unbridled license. The mighty man glories not in his might, nor the rich man in his riches, nor the Philistine in his warlike prowess, nor the savage in his contempt for civilization, but all glory in having the honour to be numbered among those who know God. In Zion is neither Babylonian, nor Egyptian, nor Philistine, nor Tyrian, nor Ethiopian, but God is all and in all.

We are apt to be surprised at finding such utterances in the Old Testament, the sacred book of an elect race, looking on it as a religious duty to keep themselves apart from the rest of the world. But, on reflection, one comes to see that the occurrence of such catholic utterances in the Hebrew Scriptures was only

Die Psalmen.
 Schriftbeweis, vol. iii. p. 526.
 The Septuagint renders the last clause of ver. 7, ή κατοικία εν σοί.

what was to be expected, if, as these Scriptures themselves represent, God's purpose in Israel's call was, from the first, one which respected the whole world. In that case, Israel's election was but a method adopted by God for blessing all peoples through one; blessing the chosen race first, that she might in turn be qualified for blessing all the rest. There was temporary exclusion of the outlying nations in order to eventual inclusion. What wonder, if such were God's plan, that there should be scattered up and down the sacred Scriptures of the elect race passages reminding those who belonged thereto that they were chosen, not for their own sakes, and so furnishing an antidote to the narrowing influence of an isolated position? We are, therefore, not at all surprised to find such an ode as that we have been studying in the Psalter. One thing only awakens in us wonder, a wonder which continued study of the Psalm rather increases than diminishes, viz., how a man to whom such a bright and glorious thought was given could be content to utter his thought in so few and so enigmatic words. But this is the way of the inspired vates. He inclines his ear to a parable, and utters his dark saying upon the harp, and relapses into silence, leaving his spoken word to work its way into the general thought of the world.

ALEXANDER B. BRUCE.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

IN THE SUPERSCRIPTION OF HIS EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.—NO. 2.

VERSES 3 and 4.—Περὶ τοῦ υίοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υίοῦ θεοῦ ἐν εὐνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα άγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.—King James's Version.

Concerning his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who, while descended from the lineage of David in respect to the flesh, was, in virtue of the resurrection of the dead, determined to be God's Son in power, in respect to the spirit of holiness.—The Writer's Revised Version.

These verses have been the battle-field of many exegetical and theological conflicts, and have given occasion to a large amount of special polemical literature. Servetus, in his day, said that they "had never been understood." Professor Jowett, in our day, regards them as among "the most difficult in the Epistles of St. Paul. We cannot," he says, "express their meaning adequately, we can only approach it." We do not purpose to concern ourselves, polemically, with the contests that have been agitated. Neither shall we pretend to grasp or comprehend the grand realities of superhuman being that are referred to in the Apostle's

2 "Epistles of St. Paul," vol. i. p. 44.

[&]quot; "Locus nunquam intellectus."—De Trinitatis Erroribus, fol. 54.

statements. It is not, strictly speaking, these grand objective realities with which, as expositors, we have to do. It is, on the contrary, the Apostle's subjective conceptions of the realities, in so far as these conceptions are revealed to us in the verbal representations that lie before us. It is no great presumption to cherish the hope that those verbal representations when calmly and candidly interrogated round and round-will, to the congenial spirit, yield the fulness of their import. Such a hope does no more than assume that the Apostle was able to render his representations luminous. Even after they have been mastered, however, we may be very far, not only from fully comprehending the great Christological realities referred to, but likewise from penetrating all the strata of evangelical thought that lay wide and deep within the abysses of the Apostle's mind. He has not revealed to us all his ideas. They do not all crop up to view. But some of them do.

We proceed then to consider the detailed contents of the two verses before us. The gospel, says the Apostle in the preceding verse, was promised in former times by God. He adds, in Verse 3, concerning his Son. Many editors of the text have regarded the pronoun here employed as of intenser import—"his own Son." So Robert Stephens in his 1550 and 1551 editions, though not in those of 1546 and 1549. The Elzevirs likewise, and Mills, Wettstein, Griesbach, as also Courcelles, Leusden, Schöttgen, Tittmann, Knapp, Vater, Hahn, Muralt. But Bengel, Matthaei, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, following in the footsteps of Erasmus and Henry Stephens, have done well in replacing the emphatic with the unemphatic pronoun

-a mere matter of softer breathing in the Greek original.

The particular "Son of God" referred to is specified in the words standing in apposition, Fesus Christ our Lord. It was He who was promised in the Old Testament pre-announcement of the gospel.

It is not Jesus Christ alone, however, who receives the designation son of God. Adam, we are informed, was God's son. I All men are God's offspring.2 Israel was, in an emphatic sense, God's son,3 Believers of the gospel are also emphatically his sons and daughters.+ Angels too are called the sons of God.5 There are other applications besides of the phrase. But there is a kind of superlative emphasis in the way in which the designation, the Son of God, is given to Jesus Christ. He "hath obtained by inheritance a more excellent name than angels. For unto which of the angels said God at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son." 6 Moses was "faithful in all his house, as a servant, but Christ as a Son over his own house." 7 Christ was God's "own Son." 8 He was his "only begotten Son." 9 He was a Son in such a sense that he could say, without presumption, "I and my Father are one." 10 He could say, without undue assumption, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." II He had no other father than God; 12 and, although when speaking of God to others He could say of Him, "My Father and your Father," 13 never-

I Luke iii. 38.

² Acts xvii. 28. 4 John i. 12; Rom. viii. 14-17; I John iii. 1.

⁷ Heb. iii. 5, 6. 6 Heb. i. 4, 5.

⁹ John iii. 16. 10 Ibid. x. 30. 12 Luke i. 34, 35. 13 John xx. 17.

³ Exod. iv. 22.

⁵ Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxvii. 7.

⁸ Rom. viii. 32.

II Ibid. xiv. 9.

theless God was more emphatically his Father than He is "our Father," or the Father of any other

beings.

Some have supposed that the designation, God's Son, as applied to Christ in the passage before us, is a term of office, and is equivalent to the phrase, the Anointed One, or the expression, the King of Israel, or the appellation, the Christ. This is the opinion of Grotius, Köllner, Winzer, Stuart; but it is quite unnatural. It is true, indeed, that it is the same high Personage who is at once the Christ, the King of Israel, and the Son of God. But to suppose that his Sonship is his Kingship or his Messiahship, is to confound things that essentially differ, and to lose sight at once of the true idea of sonship, and of the inseparable correlation of the idea to that of fatherhood. In the inter-relativity of fatherhood and sonship, community of nature is implied. And when nothing of the morally unnatural attaches, either, on the one hand, to the father, or, on the other, to the son, it is further implied that there will be, on the part of the father toward the son, a peculiarity of affection and favour. Of the three ideas, (1) community of nature, (2) intensity of affection, and (3) peculiarity of favour, sometimes one and sometimes another may stand out prominently to view. Sometimes all three may be blended into unity; and sometimes, when thus blended, they may be applied either in a higher and sublimer, or in a lower and more analogical, acceptation. But wherever there is fatherhood and sonship, and no moral violation of nature, there will be, in a lower or loftier plane of real objectivity, community of nature, intensity of affection, and peculiarity of favour. It was thus that Adam was the son of God. He was not merely created by God. He derived from God a nature which, in its moral element, was akin to that of God Himself. He was made in God's image; and, as such, he was the object of peculiar affection and favour. All mankind are, in a similar sense, God's offspring, his sons and daughters. Israel of old, as a part of mankind, were emphatically his son. They were his national son. Over and above the possession of a moral nature akin to that of God, and over and above their enjoyment of the peculiar affection which went forth, and still goes forth, from the Divine heart toward all human creatures, they were the objects of peculiar Divine favour. Hence the distinguishing element of their national sonship. Believers of the gospel are more emphatically still God's sons and daughters. They are "partakers of the divine nature," I not only in its moral 'potentiality,' but in its moral 'actuality;' and that increasingly. And hence, again, they become increasingly the objects of very peculiar Divine affection and favour. In a somewhat similar sense are holy angels the sons of God. But the designation, the Son of God, when applied to Jesus Christ, bears a meaning that is far nearer the centre of the absolute ideal of sonship. It is indeed at the very centre. Jesus Christ is, with superlative emphasis, the Son of God, because there is absolute identity of nature between Him and the Father, and that not only morally, but likewise 'physically' or 'metaphysically;' while He is, at the same time, the object of an infinite fulness of paternal affection, and is divinely exalted, in the enjoyment of favour and honour and glory, far above all created principalities and powers on earth

and in heaven. It was some such conception, apparently, of the sonship of Jesus Christ, that was in the mind of the Apostle when he said that the gospel, of which he was the herald, was, in its pre-announcement by God through his prophets, in sacred Old Testament writings, a promise concerning his Son.

In King James's English Version, and in our Revised Rendering, the words *Jesus Christ our Lord* are introduced immediately after the expression his Son; but as in the original they stand at the conclusion of the fourth verse, we shall postpone the consideration of them till we have discussed the intermediate clauses.

The Apostle, immediately on giving the designation of the illustrious Being who, in the complexity of his glorious personality, is the subject-matter of the gospel, seems to have thought that it would be well to distinguish and explain. He who was the personal subjectmatter of the gospel was indeed God's Son. That was his pre-eminent filial relationship. But there was complexity in his relation of filiation; and a complexity which, even in its humbler element, linked Him on to what was honourable and august. Hence the succeeding words, who was descended from the lineage of David, in respect to the flesh. Even in the humbler element of his complex being He was of royal descent. And his royal pedigree was the most illustrious. He was of "the house of David." In the specification of this relationship, the Apostle might intend both to anticipate an objection to his representation of our Lord's sonship, and to augment his readers' idea of the dignity of the Being whose person and work form the Alpha and the Omega of the gospel.

The phrase, who descended, is a free translation of the original expression; but, though free, it is correct, and is certainly to be preferred to the translation of the Latin Vulgate, who was made to him, I which not only interjects, apocryphally and incongruously, the pronoun to him, that is to God, but also strains and somewhat distorts the natural import of the verb. As Beza, however, retained the Vulgate verb was made, the same somewhat distorted translation descended, through the English Geneva, to King James's Version. Laurentius Valla substituted was born to him,2 for was made to him: and Erasmus admitted, so far as the verb is concerned, the same translation into his Version. It was adopted by Luther, and after Luther retained by Piscator, and after Piscator by Bengel, in their respective German Versions. Many of the more modern translators and expositors, inclusive of Meyer, Van Hengel, Krehl, Rilliet, retain the Version of Valla, though of course excluding the apocryphal pronoun. St. Augustine informs us that even in his day born 3 was found in some of the Latin codices instead of made. It is certainly an allowable translation, though free, and too modal in its freedom, as much so as the Version of Tyndale, "the which was begotten of the seed of David." Other translators, again, in avoiding this extreme of modality, have landed in the opposite extreme, by using the simple substantive verb, "who was of the lineage," or, "of the race of David." Ewald's translation is better, "who came out of David's seed." 4 Michaelis's is better still, "who descended from David." 5

[&]quot; "Qui factus est ei."

² "Qui genitus est ei."

^{3 &}quot;Natus."

^{4 &}quot;Der aus Davids Samen kam."

^{5 &}quot;Der von David abstammet."

The variety of Versions is remarkable, and all of them are free. But we are shut up, at once in Latin, English, German, Dutch, French, Italian, to use some freedom or other in reproducing the Apostle's idea. His idea is literally, "who became of the seed of David," an excellent idiom in Greek, but entirely unidiomatic in such a language as our own. The word, unlike the substantive verb was, expresses origination; and, unlike born and begotten, it does not express a particular mode of origination. The idea certainly is that our Lord genealogically sprang from the lineage of David. He was, as Grynaeus expresses it in his Version, a descendant of David.

The expression, David's seed, as used by the Apostle, has in it a peculiar tinge of Hebraism. The Hebrews, though by no means monopolizing—in contradistinction to the Greeks for instance—the word seed in the sense of progeny, yet used it so habitually in its genealogical acceptation, that their custom stereotyped itself into a national idiom. In the application of this idiom, the legally genealogical element predominated over the purely physical. And hence, even although in connection with the passage before us it could be proved—as it never can be—that Mary, our Lord's virgin-mother. was not herself of the lineage of David, it would still be the case that, in true genealogical phraseology, our Lord sprang from David's seed. He was legally, in virtue of Mary's betrothal to Joseph, the descendant of David. Joseph's legal relationship passed over in its effects to Mary. And thus it is that in the genealogies of both St. Matthew and St. Luke the pedigree of our Lord is given through Joseph. Augustine thought that the expression before us was evidence of Mary's consanguinity to David; but he admitted and contended, nevertheless, that even although it could be proved that there was no such consanguinity, the legal genealogy through Joseph would amply suffice for the validity of the affirmation that our Lord was David's son.¹

The additional expression, with respect to the flesh, is, in the original,2 anarthrous, with respect to flesh. Such a translation might be tolerated were it not for the antithetic expression in the following verse, with respect to the spirit of holiness,3 which could on no account bear to be represented thus, with respect to spirit of holiness. In our English idiom we require to supply, as regards this second member of the antithesis, either the article or the possessive pronoun. We must say, either, with respect to 'the' spirit of holiness, or, with respect to 'his' spirit of holiness. And thus, on the assumption that a real antithesis is intended, we must, to preserve concinnity, render the expression before us, either, with respect to 'the' flesh, or, with respect to 'his' flesh. So far from perfect coincidence is the usage of the two languages in reference to the article.

Rückert, indeed, supposes that there is peculiar significance in the anarthrous condition of the expression. He thinks that the absence of the article is a proof that the Apostle does not mean *in respect to his flesh*, but merely intended to qualify, in an adverbial manner, the preceding participle, so that the mode of the genealogical event referred to might be expressed. The

Consensus Evangelistarum, lib. ii. c. 4.
 ³ κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης.

Apostle's entire expression would thus, according to Rückert, be equivalent to this, who was descended, in a fleshly way, of the seed of David. The one great but insuperable objection to this interpretation arises from the antithesis of the phrase to the correlative phrase in the fourth verse. This correlative phrase cannot be understood as adverbially qualifying the participle determined. It points to some higher element in the complex being of our Lord. And hence we seem to be shut up to regard the antithetic expression of the third verse as pointing to the lower element of his complex being-in respect to his flesh. The article is legitimately dispensed with, just because the nature of the case, as spreading out into view in the amplitude of the entire paragraph, rendered the Apostle's reference sufficiently definite when made the object of his own subjective reflection.

The range of reference that is to be attributed to the word flesh has been matter of dispute. Paulus confines it strictly to the material element of our Lord's humanity. So did Taylor long before him, and John Locke before Taylor, and Crell before John Locke. So does Köllner, and so, very expressly, do Schrader, Oltramare, and Mehring. But the great majority of expositors, following in the footsteps of the Fathers, suppose that the expression is intended to cover the entire area of our Lord's human nature. The translation of the phrase might therefore be, with respect to his human nature, or with respect to his humanity. Beza well represents the general opinion of expositors when he explains the expression as meaning, in so far as he was a man.² Both opinions are so far right, when they

¹ The Körperlichkeit.

are respectively stripped of their polemical antagonism to each other. There can be no doubt that flesh just means flesh. There can likewise be no doubt that, in the New Testament usage of the term, it has, in at least a considerable number of instances, an exclusive reference to what is material and corporeal. And there can also be no doubt that, so far as Christ's genealogical descent from David was concerned, it was really the corporeal element that was derived. All this is unquestionable. But then, on the other hand, there can be just as little doubt that, in common Hebrew usage, when the term flesh was applied to man, there was very often subtending the word a reference more or less distinct to the full complement of human nature. Hence the frequently recurring expression, all flesh, as meaning all men: "Unto thee shall all flesh come;" "Let all flesh bless his holy name," &c. When something was denied of all flesh, its presence was affirmed of nobody. I Indeed, our English idiomatic expression, every 'body,' corresponds almost to a nicety to the Hebrew idiomatic expression, all 'flesh;' and in that Saxon phrase the body is evidently to be understood as having, subtending it, a reference to the full complement of human nature. Such, we doubt not, is the range of the reference of the word flesh when it is said of our Lord, "the Word was made flesh," that is, the Word became incarnate, and thus human—the Word became man. Such too is the complementive range of the Apostle's kindred but more complex expression, "I conferred not with flesh and blood."2 His meaning is, I conferred not with human beings, I conferred not with men. And when he elsewhere speaks to Christian ser-

¹ See Rom. ii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29.

vants in reference to their "masters according to the flesh," he refers not exclusively to the merely corporeal element in the complex being of their terrestrial masters. He refers to their human masters, as distinguished from their Divine Lord.

While the word flesh, then, in the passage before us, does denote flesh, and was obviously intended to have the point or angle of its reference turned distinctly toward the corporeal element of our Lord's human nature, there is no need for supposing that that angle was intended to hide from view the complement of his humanity. We may, on the contrary, with perfect propriety suppose that, in virtue of the Hebrew idiom, a further reach of reference was recognized as subtending its angular point. Physiologically speaking, there must have been something present to the Apostle's view beyond mere flesh. The term cannot reasonably be regarded as excluding all that was not really fleshblood for instance, and bones and skin. And if there must be thus subtending it a reference to other physiological elements of human nature, besides its own physiological self, we cannot see that there can be any great objection, so far as the word itself is concerned, to the entertainment of the supposition that the subtended reference, after the license of the common Hebrew idiom, spreads itself out indefinitely, and in dimness of discrimination, till it embraces the entire complement of human nature. It would be wrong, indeed, to suppose that to the Apostle's mind the natural corporeal point of the word's import became shaded off. It would be also wrong to suppose that he had present to his consciousness the precise distinctions which are conventional in our analytic philosophy of

humanity. It would be still further wrong to suppose that if he had our distinctions present in his consciousness, he meant to give his imprimatur to the idea that the human soul and spirit are propagated from individual to individual in a traducian manner. But it is as certainly right to presume that the Apostle handled his language in the free and easy way that all educated persons, when really at their ease, approve of and practise. He affected not to be a precisian in his phrases. Realizing as he did that on the nether side of Christ's complex nature He was really human, while on the upper side He was as really Divine, nothing is more reasonable than that, in speaking of our Lord's inferior relationship, and of that relationship genealogically viewed, he should seize upon the undermost and outermost of its elements, not only without intending to shut out from the perspective the other and interior elements that are complementive of human nature, but with the express intention of having them taken into view, as naturally subtending the element that is specified. "What are you doing, O Paul?" says Chrysostom: "first lifting our minds aloft towards the great things of the gospel, and then bringing us down to David? Tell me, Are you speaking of some mere man?" "He that would lead us to heaven," he replies, "must lead us up from below: for so was the actual Divine arrangement (respecting our Lord). People first of all saw Him a man upon earth, and then they discovered that He was God." I Even in recognizing Him as a man, the order of their perceptions was in the ascending mood. They first of all saw what was but flesh and blood, and thence they as-

ι Πρώτον γοῦν είζον αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ γῆς, και τότε ἐνόησαν Θεόν.

cended to the recognition of soul and mind. There is thus beautiful propriety in the Apostle's phraseology. He takes hold of human nature by its sensuous and most conspicuous element. And when we bear in mind that he was speaking of a genealogical derivation, we see that there is more than propriety, there is the strictest accuracy. For not only was there the complexity of the human and the Divine in the unity of our Lord's peculiar personality, there was "wheel within wheel." In his human nature there was a complexity of sub-natures. There was both soul and body. I And therefore, when mention is made of his descent from the stock of David, there is something finely discriminative, and discriminatively accurate, in having the reference limited, so far as concerns the externality of phraseology, as distinguished from the inwardly subtending perspective of idea, to that constituent of the being which is capable of derivation from generation to generation. I. MORISON.

A BIBLICAL NOTE.

GALATIANS I. 19.

Most recent commentators on the Epistle to the Galatians have now arrived at the conclusion that the "James" here described as "the Lord's brother" could not have been one of the original Twelve Apostles. The reasons for this conclusion have been ably and convincingly stated by Bishop Lightfoot in his Commentary on this Epistle.² The same commentators,

¹ Isa. liii. 10; Matt. xxvi. 38.

² See his "Dissertation on the Brethren of the Lord," and the detached note "On the Name and Office of an Apostle,"

however, agree in affirming that he must be regarded as one of the Apostles in the wider sense of that term which is sometimes found in the Epistles of the New Testament, Such an inference seems inevitable, if there is no other rendering possible of Galatians i. 19 than that given in our Authorized Version.

The objections to this interpretation are (1) that the whole scope of the Apostle's argument in this portion of his Letter is to establish his independence of those who were in authority in the Church at Jerusalem, and whom he describes, without any qualifying expression, as "the Apostles," or "them which were Apostles before me." Such a designation could not be applied to any but those who had received the apostolic commission from our Lord Himself, as witnesses of his resurrection, and from whom "the brethren of the Lord" are expressly distinguished in Acts i. 14.

(2) All that we know of this James from Scripture and tradition shews that he, at least, among the brethren of the Lord, was, as Bishop Lightfoot says, "a stationary ruler of the mother-church at Jerusalem, as its resident bishop or presiding elder." The term "Apostle," therefore, could not in any sense be properly applied to him as it was to Paul himself, or to Barnabas, or to those who are called "messengers ($\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \sigma} \tau o \lambda o \iota$) of the churches." His office was rather to send out such messengers himself, as head of the Church at Jerusalem.

These difficulties have induced some to favour another explanation of this Verse, by which $\epsilon i \mu \hat{\eta}$ is taken in the sense of "but only," and the passage is thus rendered: "Other of the Apostles I saw none,

¹ See 2 Cor. vii. 23; Gal. ii. 12,

but only James the Lord's brother." But, as Bishop Lightfoot has observed in his Note, "the sense of ἔτερον naturally links it with εἰ μὴ, from which it cannot be separated without harshness, and ἔτερον carries τὼν ἀποστόλων with it." There is, however, another use of ἔτερος with a genitive, which, so far as I know, has not been noticed by any expositor, ancient or modern. It is well known that this adjective, like ἀλλῶως and others, may have a comparative force, and be accompanied by a genitive or by the conjunction ἤ. Thus Aristotle, in his treatise De Mundo, speaks of "an element other than the four (commonly so called)," στοιχεῖον ἔτερον τῶν τεσσάρων. Why should we not, then, translate the Apostle's words: "Other than the Apostles I saw not, save James the Lord's brother"?

According to this view, the meaning of the writer is that he saw none on that occasion of a different class from that of "the Apostles," except James, the Lord's brother. That he should have seen him also was quite natural, and almost unavoidable, since, though not an Apostle, his name is put first in this Epistle, with those of "Cephas and John," as one of the three "pillars" ² of the Church.

J. S. PURTON.

¹ Comp. Thuc, i, 28, ϕ ίλους ποιεῖσθαι οὕς οὐ βούλονται, ἐτέροτς τῶν νῦν ὅντων, Sce also Herodot, iv, 126,
² Gal. ii. 9.

ECCLESIASTES.

CHAPTER II. VERSES I-II.

- 1. I said in vine heart. Go to now, let me prove thee with mirth, and take the delight in pleasure: and behold, this also was vanity. 2. I said of laughter, It is mad; and of mirth, What doeth it?
- 3. I purp with my heart to yield my flesh unto wine, whilst my heart will its curve with which me and to lay hold on folly, until I should see what was good for the sons of men to do under heaven.
- 4. I engaged in great works; I builded me houses; I planted me vineyards; 5. I made me gardens and parks, and I planted in them all manner of fruit-trees; 6. I made me pools of water, to water therewith the forest luxuriant with trees; 7. I purchased me men-servants and mailens, and had slaves form in my house; also I had possessions of hords and I sks in abundance, above all that were in Ferusalem infore me: 8. I gathered me also silver and gold, and the treasures of kings and the provinces: I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, concubines of all sorts.

9. So I was great, and was increased more than all that were before me in Ferusalem: moreover my wisdom remained with me.

10. And whatsoever mine eyes desired, I kept not from them: I refused not my heart any joy: for my heart rejoiced because of all my labour, and this was my portion for all my labour.

11. Then I looked on all my works that my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I had laboured to do: and behold, it was all vanity, and a striving after the wind, neither is there any profit under the sun.

THE first experiment of the Preacher has failed. He had entered upon his self-imposed task with ardour, he had tried to read the riddle of the world, he had hoped to sketch out some bold theory of life that should give a loop-hole of escape from the dull monotony which SEPTEMBER, 1879.

stretched its leaden sceptre over the universe; but he had been baffled. The task was all too hard for him. He had gained nothing from it but a sense of weariness. The disappointment was naturally the more acute and mortifying in proportion to the nobleness of the investigation and the eagerness with which he had pursued it. Perhaps he has been sage before the time. The next experiment shall be in a different vein. It is no use breaking one's heart over the follies and miseries of the world; better forget them, better try another course, and taste those pleasures which seem to yield the bulk of men satisfaction.

It is necessary to remark here, as this is a point which has been missed by several interpreters, that in what follows, to the end of Verse 11, we have an account, not of one, but of three, or at least two, different experiments. First, the Preacher is allured by pleasures which have a certain refinement and delicacy of flavour. Then (Verse 3) the coarser gratifications of the senses exercise their influence. And then (Verse 4) he turns from these to more serious pursuits, to occupations which, like mirth and pleasure, divert him from anxious and fretting thought, but which are more worthy of a rational being.

Verse 1.—I said in my heart, or perhaps, "I spake with my heart:" it is a dialogue like that of Tennyson's Two Voices. Let me prove thee: it is an experiment which he will try. And take thy delight in pleasure. The literal rendering is, "And look thou upon good;" to look upon a thing being a common Hebrew idiom for finding delight and satisfaction in it, as, for instance, in the phrase, "Mine eye shall see its desire upon mine enemies," which is, literally, "Mine eye

shall look upon mine enemies;" and "good," which has a large sense, being here defined by the context to mean pleasure. Then follows the conclusion from this experiment, as from the last, behold, this also was vanity. I said of laughter, It is mad (literally, "it is a madman," laughter being personified), and of mirth, What docth it.' "What is the use of it? What good comes of it?" In the very midst of the festive merriment, when the revel was the loudest and the song the gayest, there came that strange sudden darkening of mirth in the midst of it, that going out as of a light in a moment, when all seems brightest and most joyous, which makes a man wonder that he should ever have sought for happiness in such scenes. A similar strain of feeling is expressed by the Latin Epicurean poet, many of whose lines remind one of Ecclesiastes

Hoc etiam faciunt, ubi discubuere, tenentque
Pocula sæpe homines, et inumbrant ora coronis,
Ex animo ut dicant, "brevis hic est fructus homullis
Jam fuerit, neque post unquam revocare licebit."

LUCRETIUS, iii. 912-15.

So far, the experiment is of a general kind. The Preacher has laid aside his study of man and his pursuit of wisdom, with the deliberate intention of finding satisfaction in a course the very opposite to that on which he first set out.

Verse 3.—I purposed in my heart, or rather, "I made search in my heart," the word being one which, as we have already seen (Chap. i. 13), is used of the spies sent to spy out the land of Canaan. The expression denotes, especially when compared with that at the beginning of Verse 1, a new experiment. It implies also that this was no hasty careless resolve, no obedience

to a sudden impulse, no yielding to the strong tide of sensual passions, but the deliberate determination to make a fair trial of all that life had to offer. What was the purpose in this instance? The words that follow are confessedly difficult. Of the older interpreters, the LXX. completely misunderstand them, and the Vulgate affixes a sense to them which is exactly the opposite of the true sense, and in defiance of the plainest requirements of grammar: "I thought in my heart to withdraw my flesh from wine (abstrahere a vino carnem meam), that I might transfer my mind to wisdom, and avoid folly," &c. Jerome is much nearer the mark. He renders: Ut traherem in vino carnem meam; and he paraphrases: "I wished to give my life up to sensual enjoyment, and to rid my flesh of all anxieties, and to lull it with pleasure as with wine; but reflection and natural reason, which God has implanted even in sinners, drew me back, and led me to seek wisdom, and to trample folly underfoot." Jerome is so far right that he sees that wine is here put for sensual enjoyment of all kinds, and that Qoheleth means to assert that the higher nature still retained the mastery in the midst of pleasure. But he has not caught the exact sense of the passage. Our Authorized Version gives a paraphrase, and cuts the knot of the difficulty by rendering: "to give myself unto wine." But this entirely misses the important word "flesh" (used here in its ethical sense, as denoting the region of the appetites and passions), and hence obliterates the contrast so obviously intended between the animal nature and the spiritual. The literal rendering of the words is: "I made search in my heart (thinking) to draw my flesh with wine, whilst my heart guided it [or held the reins] with wisdom." The phrase, "to draw my flesh with wine," has been very variously interpreted. It has been explained (1) "To draw out, to continue, and so to confirm, strengthen," &c., this sense being supported by such phrases as those of drawing at loving-kindness or anger (Jer. xxxi. 3; Psa. lxxxv. 5); or (2) with a modification of this meaning, "to cherish my flesh with wine," as though the verb were equivalent to the Latin tracture, in the phrase. So benignius tracture; or (3) to entice my body with wine; or (4) to draw my body with wine, wine being the moving, inspiring element by which it is drawn, as a chariot is drawn by the horse.

This last sense appears to me to be the most probable. The tlesh-i.e., the senses -is the chariot; the .wine—pleasure, sensual indulgence—is the fierce horse by which the chariot of the flesh is drawn; the heart —here, as so frequently in Hebrew, the understanding, or the higher nature at large—is the charioteer which guides and restrains the senses and appetites. Of course, it may be urged against this explanation that, in strict propriety of speech, it is the flesh, and not the wine, which is the unruly animal. No doubt, in Plato's exquisite myth,2 which has been compared with this, there is this difference. In that wonderful picture of the charioteer with his two horses, the flesh—the sensual nature, with its lusts and appetites—is compared to the wild horse, following blindly its own impulses, strong-necked, black, with bloodshot furious eyes, violent and reckless, shaggy-eared, deaf, hard-

² Phædrus, 54 f.

^{*} Several other interpretations have been given, but they hardly deserve notice. Hengstenberg renders the latter clause of the Verse, "and my heart led wisdom," i.e., took wisdom for its companion in sensual enjoyment—kept it by its side.

vielding to whip and spur; the gentle horse, for which a word is enough, is the pure feeling, the love which knows no admixture of earthly dross; and the charioteer is the vovs, or Reason, exactly corresponding to the Hebrew "heart," which guides the chariot with wisdom. But this does not justify us in putting a forced and unnatural meaning upon the passage in Ooheleth, and rendering, as Professor Tayler Lewis does: "I sought, when my flesh was furiously driving on in wine or pleasure ('in wine' here denoting, not the instrument or figurative chariot, but the state or condition), to draw it, to restrain it, to bridle it, to keep it in the path of temperance." It is sufficient to observe that here we have no elaborately wrought-out figure, as we have in Plato; the comparison is merely suggested by the use of metaphorical terms, and then dropped. The general sense is clear. The Preacher did stoop to the pleasures of the senses, but his prudent self-control never forsook him. Even in the midst of sensual indulgence there was no sensual excess. The passions were not let loose to do their own bidding: discretion held the reins. Hence it is that he adds, "and to lay hold of folly." So he calls pleasure: he knew it to be folly. This was a part of the strange charm of the experiment. He was lord of himself, only stooping to pleasure that he might learn, if possible, the secret of its fascination, but never suffering it to win the mastery of him for a moment.

The expression, "to lay hold on folly," goes further than that on which we have already commented in the previous chapter, "to know wisdom and folly." Qoheleth would grasp it, make it his own, force it to give up its secrets. The principle is the same. "Things are

best known," says Jerome, "by their opposites" (Contraria centrariis intelligentur). How could a man "see what was good for the sons of men to do under heaven the brief number of the days of their life," if he had only had experience of one side of that life, if he had not sounded all its depths, penetrated all its disguises, made himself master of all its secrets? Here, then, we have Qoheleth's second experiment sketched briefly in its two main stages; of genial mirth, of unrestrained gaiety, on the one hand, and of sensual enjoyment on the other. But here let us retrace our steps for a moment.

The failure of that first experiment is instructive. We can conceive a man feeling deep sympathy with all that human nature which he had set himself to study, with the joys and sorrows, the cares and passions and struggles of everyday life, longing and striving to help, to guide, to comfort the beings among whom he moved; we can imagine such a man, weary, no doubt, sad at times, when he thought of evils that he could not alleviate, of burdens that he could not bear, vet brave and cheerful withal, like St. Paul, "sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing." But this would be a Christian mood. The mood of Ooheleth is very different. His is the temper of the critic. There is the irritation and the bitterness of the man who is sagacious enough to see what is wrong, to fasten his thoughts upon that, but who finds the frame of the world too stubborn to be moulded by his touch.

How natural the recoil! How natural to listen to the whisper which says, Snatch the pleasures of life, "crown thyself with roses before they be withered, and let no tlower of the spring pass by." It is Solomon's history

which we are reading. How true, therefore, is the order in which the two experiments suggest themselves: not pleasure first, and then the calmer, more philosophic mood, but first the attempt to bring the world within the domain of the capacious intellect, "the large heart," and then the reaction. Sensual enjoyment was not the first attraction in his case. It could not be in the case of any man of "large heart." But the very disgust at finding the first experiment fail drives him with a kind of cynical bitterness into trying the other. Goethe, in his Faust, shews the same knowledge of human nature. Faust is no mere sensualist. Faust has been a hard student; he is a man of cultivated mind; he has explored many avenues of knowledge; but he has found satisfaction nowhere. He is tormented by desires which he cannot satisfy. "The Great Spirit," he exclaims, "has poured contempt upon me; Nature is closed against me; the thread of thought is broken asunder; I have long turned away with loathing from knowledge in all its forms: now let me plunge deep in pleasure, and still thus the burning throb of passionate desire!" It is the same recoil which we have in Ecclesiastes from the pursuit of wisdom, the same determination to shake off the weary weight of thought, and forget it in the wild tumult of dissipation and folly.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

VII. THE INTERVENTION OF ELIHU.

FIRST DISCOURSE (CHAPTERS XXXII. 6—XXXIII. 33).

In his opening discourse Elihu undertakes to prove both that God does speak to men at sundry times and in divers manners, and that He chastens men in love rather than in anger,—the proof being that the Divine chastening is corrective and medicinal:

'tis a physic That's bitter to sweet end.

This double thesis is woven into one with singular skill, and vet in the simplest and most natural way. His first thesis, that God speaks to men, Elihu proves (1) by generalizing the experience of Eliphaz (Comp. Chap. xxxiii. 15 18 with Chap. iv. 12-21, and especially Chap. xxxiii. 15 with Chap. iv. 13), and shewing that as God spoke to him in dream and vision, so also He speaks to all men; (2) by generalizing the experience of Job, and shewing that all men are taught, as he was taught, by pain, by the discipline of sorrow and experience; and (3) by generalizing (as I suspect) his own experience, and shewing that as he himself had gained his new "conviction" by an angel or messenger, who had interpreted him to himself, so also all men are "shewn what is right" by some of the great company of teachers and interpreters at the command of God. But while thus proving his first thesis, Elihu is careful to prove his second also. For again and again (Chap. xxxiii. 17, 18, 23-26, 29, 30) he points out that the end of God in these several modes of disclosing his will to men is an end of mercy and

compassion; that He speaks to them in order to train them in righteousness, and thus to bring back their souls from death, that they may grow light in the light of life. In this simple yet skilful way his two themes are fused into a single argument of remarkable and perennial interest and force.

But this argument is preceded by the exordium, which has so deeply—and, as I think, so unreasonably—stirred the ire of the critics. For Chapter xxxii. contains the general exordium to his whole "discourse;" while in Chapter xxxiii., Verses 1–7, we have only the exordium to the first section of that discourse. Before we touch the argument of Elihu, then, we must at least glance at this general exordium, in which he addresses himself to the Friends, and, as I am inclined to believe, to the circle of bystanders, before he enters on his reply to Job. I am much mistaken if a fair and sympathetic exposition of it will not suffice to clear it from the aspersions which have been so long and so plentifully lavished upon it.

CHAPTERS XXXII. AND XXXIII.

CHAP. XXXII. Young am I, and ye are very old;

Therefore I was afraid,

And durst not shew you my conviction.

I said, "Let age speak,

And the multitude of years teach wisdom:"

8. But it is the spirit that is in man,

And the inspiration of the Almighty which giveth him understanding;

9. It is not the great who are wise,

Nor the old who understand what is right:

10. Therefore I say, "Hearken unto me,

I, even I, will shew you my conviction."

11. Behold. I waited for your swords

Behold, I waited for your words,
I gave ear to your arguments,
Till ye had thoroughly scarched out what to say;

I2.	But though I have straitly marked you,
	Lo, none of you hath refuted Fob,
	Nor answered his words.
13.	Lest ye should say, "We have found out wisdom,"
	God, not man, shall vanquish him.
14.	He indeed hath not directed his words against me,
,	But neither will I answer him with your arguments.
15.	They were broken down; they answered no more;
J	They were bereft of words:
16.	And I waited, but they spake not;
	They were at a stand, and answered no more.
17.	But now I will reply for myself,
7	I, even I, will show my conviction;
rS.	For I am full of words,
	The spirit in my breast constraineth me;
19.	My breast is like wine that hath no vent,
	Like new wineskins it is ready to burst:
20.	I will speak, that I may get me case,
	I will open my lips and reply.
21.	No, indeed, I will accept no man's person,
	And I will flatter no man;
22.	For I know not how to flatter:
	Speedily would my Maker cut me off [if I did].
Снар	. XXXIII. But hear now, O Fob, my words,
	And give ear to all my pleas;
2.	Behold, now, I open my mouth,
	My tongue speaketh within my palate:
3.	My words shall be sincere as my heart,
	And my lips shall utter knowledge purely.
4.	The Spirit of God hath created me,
	And the inspiration of the Almighty quickened me.
5.	Answer me, if thou canst;
	Array thyself before me: stand forth.
6.	Lo, I, like you, am of God,
	I also am moulded of clay!
7-	Lo, dread of me need not affright thee,
	Nor my dignity weigh heavily upon thee!
8.	But thou hast spoken in mine ears,
	And surely I heard a sound of words [such as these].—
9.	"Pure am I, free from sin;
	Spotless, and there is no iniquity in me:

176	THE BOOK OF FOB.
10.	Behold, he seeketh a quarrel with me, He holdeth me for his foe:
	He thrusteth my feet into the stocks,
II.	He watcheth all my ways!"
12.	Behold, in this—I will answer thee—thou art not just
	For God is too great for man.
13.	Wherefore didst thou contend against Him.
13.	That of none of his dealings will He give account?
14.	Nay, but in one way God does speak,
* 4 '	Yea, in two, only man heedeth not:
15.	In dreams, in visions of the night,
13.	When deep sleep falleth on men,
	In slumberings upon the bed,
16.	Then He openeth the ear of men,
	And secretly admonisheth them,
17.	That He may withdraw man from his deeds,
	And hide from him his pride;
1 S.	That He may hold back his soul from the pit,
	And his life from perishing by the dart:
19.	Or he is chastened with pain upon his couch,
	So that he writheth in great agony,
20.	And his appetite abhorreth food,
	And his soul dainty viands;
21.	His flesh wasteth out of sight,
	And his bones, which were unseen, stand out,
22.	Yea, his soul draweth nigh to the grave,
	And his life to the angels of death;
23.	Yet if there be an angel to interpret for him,
	One out of a thousand,
	To shew man what is right,
24.	Then doth He pity him, and say,
	"Deliver him from going down into the grave,
	I have found a ransom:"
25.	His flesh becometh fresher than a child's,
	He returneth to the days of his youth;
26.	He prayeth unto God, and He accepteth him,
	He beholdeth his face with cries of joy;
	For He restoreth unto man his uprightness:
27.	He chanteth unto men, and saith,
	" I had sinned and perverted right,

But I am not requited as I deserve;

28.	He hath rescued my soul from going down to the grave,
	I live and behold the light."
29.	Behold, God doeth all these things,
	Twice, thrice, with man,
30.	To bring back his soul from the grave,
	That it may grow light in the light of life.

31.	Mark well, O Fob, hearken unto me;
	Hold thy peace, and I will speak on:
32.	Yet if thou hast aught to say, answer thou me,
	Speak, for I desire to find thee innocent;
33.	If not, hear thou me:
	Hold the peace and I will teach thee wisdom

In the exordium of his discourse Elihu first of all addresses himself to the discomfited Friends, alleging (Chapter xxxii., Verse 6) his youth and his reverence for age as the reasons which had so long kept him silent, although he was possessed by a strong and intimate "conviction" which he burned to utter. For it is no mere "opinion" that has grown hot within him as he has listened to them, but a deep inward persuasion. He is about to tell them, not what he thinks merely, but what he knows-that of which he is inwardly and fully convinced. According to the received opinion, "With many years is wisdom;" and Elihu is far from denying that age brings sagacity, or from treating with contempt the prophetic strain to which old experience doth attain (Verse 7). But age is not the only, not even the highest, source of wisdom. It is as men live and walk after the spirit (πνεθμα) which they derive from God that they prepare themselves to receive the inspiration of the Almighty. This-as in another form Job had asserted in Chapter xxviii.is the true source of wisdom, whether to old or young, great or simple (Verses 8, 9). And no doubt in this

indirect, but surely not immodest, way Elihu does here claim for his "conviction" that he had received it straight from God-that it was too pure and good to be anything short of an inspiration from Heaven. It is because he felt himself "moved" by God that heeven he, young as he is-claims attention for the conviction he is about to "shew" (Verse 10). No one can charge him with having been either "swift to speak" or "slow to hear." With curious and attentive sense he had waited for the words of the aged men who had come to "comfort" Job, and weighed them when they were uttered. With impatient surprise he had marked how they had had to hunt for arguments. and to "search for what they should say." With shame and indignation he had seen with what small success they had searched for pleas, how utterly they had failed to give Job any answer worthy of the name, to meet his arguments with counter arguments of superior force (Verses 11, 12). He can only account for their failure by supposing that, lest men so wise. and so persuaded of their own wisdom, should grow arrogant in an hour of triumph, and conclude that Wisdom dwelt with them and would die with them. God had doomed them to fail, and reserved the victory to Himself (Verse 13). And he is encouraged to speak at last, not only by the fact that he is moved to speak by God, but also because he is conscious that the point to which he has been moved by the inspiration of the Almighty is one which neither Job nor the Friends had touched—that he is about to take up a position which the Friends had failed to occupy, against which therefore Job had marshalled none of his arguments (Verse 14). It would almost seem that

Elihu had caught a glimpse, a prevision, of St. Paul's canon, that God chooses the foolish things of the world to put to shame the wise, and weak things to put to shame the strong (1 Cor. i. 20 29), in order that no flesh may glory in his presence.

Verses 15-20 are so mere a repetition of Verses 11 14. that I am disposed to think Elihu, at this point, turns from the Friends, to whom he had hitherto addressed himself, and, before he commences his address to Job (Chap. xxxiii. 1, ct scq.), appeals to the audience, the circle of bystanders on the mesbele, whose presence and whose interest in the debate we are too apt to forget. The supposition derives some support from, as indeed it was suggested by, the fact that in Verses 15 and 16 the pronouns are in the third person plural, instead of, as before, in the second. All the Commentators whom I have consulted take this as an instance of "the polite indirection" of address common in Hebrew, which often uses "they" and "them," as a German might, for "ye" or "you." But in other passages of his discourse (Chap. xxxiv. 2, 4, 7, 10, 16, 34 37) Elihu, as all are agreed, does appeal to the bystanders, the "wise men" and "men of understanding," who were listening to the discussion.1 May it not be that he also addresses them here? May it not be that he appeals to them for the truth of what he has just said, calls on them to confess that the Friends had been utterly discomfited and broken down by the cogency and vehemence of Job's replies, so that words and thoughts alike failed them, and demands whether it is not full time that the discussion

⁷ The whole of Chapter xxxiv. is addressed to the audience, though in the Verses I have cited this fact is more apparent, is indeed expressly indicated.

were removed to other and higher ground? I am disposed to think that in this hypothesis we have the key to the change in his tone at this point of his exordium, though there is no change in the matter of it.

To whomsoever he speaks, Elihu once more professes his intention to lift the argument to higher. ground. He is "full of words" (Verse 18)-full of "matter," as our Authorized Version puts it, the Original expression indicating "genuine and irrepressible convictions," which ferment within his breast like wine that has no vent; his breast is burdened and strained by them like new wineskins ready to burst (Verse 19), insomuch that, though in this case the new wine has been poured into new skins, the new truth into a fresh young heart, he must speak that he may get him ease; he is being suffocated by the inward fermentation and struggle of his spirit, and must get room to breathefor that is the real force of his expression—by uttering what is in his heart (Verse 20). To be silent would be to be unfaithful to his convictions out of deference to mere authority, from fear of incurring the censure or the suspicions of the grave and reverend men before and around him. He fears the anger of God more than the censure of man, the pain of being untrue more than the shame of rebuke; and therefore he will speak out his new truth in scorn of consequence (Verses 21, 22).

No one whose hard yet happy fate it has been to contribute to the progress of human thought, by confronting accepted dogmas with broader and larger views of truth; no one who, by the steady pressure of a growing conviction, or of a genuine inspiration from

above, has been compelled to put new wine into old skins, and has heard the Church, as well as the world. mutter, "The old is better;" no one who from love to God has been driven to overcome all fear of man, can fail to sympathize with the complex emotions by which the whole being of Elihu was stirred-with his impatience and indignation at seeing the championship of Truth assumed by partial, incompetent, and prejudiced hands; with his fear lest by giving a shock to received opinions he should injure the weak unwary minds which confuse form with substance and dooma with religion, or offend men whom he esteemed and revered, or so damage the cause he had espoused by his immature and unskilful handling of it as to retard its triumph; with his inexpressible relief when the rubicon was once passed, when his convictions were uttered, and left to the sure arbitrament of Time and of Him who shapes it to a perfect end. Looked at from this sympathetic point of view, Chapter xxxii., which has given such deadly offence to the critics and called down a storm of opprobrium and derision on Elihu's head, will be found to be a graphic and auspicious preface to the discourse in which henceforth he addresses himself to Job. And I am bold to say that, if it be interpreted in this fair and kindly sense, it will be admitted that no charge of immodesty or arrogance can be maintained against it.

In *Chapter* xxxiii. Elihu turns from the Friends and the bystanders, to address himself directly and by name to Job. He bids him

Cease to lament for that he cannot help, And study help for that which he laments. Young as he is, and comparatively unwise, he undertakes to prove that God does speak to men, and that in many ways; and he promises Job—

If you can pace your wisdom In the good path I would have it go,

you shall see that it is not in anger, but in love, that God afflicts the children of men.

He gives him many reasons why he should listen with patient attention. (1) It is no hasty and unconsidered impulse to which Elihu is about to yield, but a long-pondered and profound conviction. "Behold, now, I open my mouth" (Verse 2), a phrase which always introduces a grave and deliberate utterance, and implies that the speaker is about to employ words selected "with a leavened and prepared choice." My tongue speaketh within my palate, each word being, as it were, carefully tasted and approved before it is allowed to slip from the tongue. (2) He is about to speak from an open and honest heart that desires the truth, and (3) with plain sincerity of speech (Verse 3). Job had often complained of the oblique and dishonest utterances of the Friends (e.g., Chap. vi. 25); Elihu professes that no dishonesty shall be found in him, that with frank and unfeigned lips he will deliver only that of which his true heart is inwardly and fully persuaded. But (4) the great reason why Job should listen to him while he "shews his conviction" is, that his conviction is not his own, but an inspiration of the Almighty, an inspiration quickened in him by the God whose breath had made him a living soul (Verse 4: Comp. Chap. xxxii. 8, and see Note on that Verse). Conscious that he has received life and understanding from God his Maker, Elihu stands before Job without fear, and

challenges him to the logical strife (*Verse* 5), the origin of his boldness saving it from all taint of arrogance. Still another reason is (5) that Elihu is the very antagonist whom Job has again and again demanded. For Job had often complained, "God is not a man, as I am, whom I might answer" (Chap. ix. 32), and prayed that He would lay aside the terrors of his Majesty when He entered into judgment with him (Chap. xiii. 2); and now Elihu replies, "Here am I, a man like yourself, moulded"—or, as the expressive word means, napped—"out of the same clay; and yet, though a man, I will speak for God, for I too am from Him, and it is his spirit which gives me understanding. You need have no dread of me such as strikes you dumb before the Majesty of Heaven" (*Verses* 6, 7).

That he may be fair, impartial, sincere in his reply, and touch the real issue in dispute, Elihu sums up Job's argument so far as he is about to answer it, and sums it up, so far as brevity will allow, in the very words of his opponent. Verses 9-11 are a model of clear and concise statement, and breathe a candour which many a self-elected champion of the cause of truth would do well to imitate. With a certain incredulous amazement, as of one who could hardly believe his own ears—such is the force of Verse 8—and yet was compelled to believe them, so distinctly and vehemently had Job spoken, Elihu had heard from his lips "a sound of words" which he could only take as meaning a claim of innocence on Job's part and a charge of injustice against God. Now that Job had consistently maintained his integrity no reader of the Poem can doubt. In Chapter xii., Verse 4, he expressly calls himself "just" and "innocent." In Chap-

ter xvi., Verse 17, he affirms that there was no violence in his hand, and that his prayer was pure. In Chapter x., Verses 13-17, he elaborately contends that God knows his spotless innocence, and yet hunts him down as if he were stained and saturated with an ineradicable guilt. Of all these and many similar passages Elihu gives a fair summary in the words he now attributes to Job: "Pure am I, free from sin; spotless, and there is no iniquity in me. But God seeketh a quarrel with me-finds alienations in me, causes and grounds for hostility," while the other words he attributes to him are simply verbatim citations of words actually used by Job. Thus, "He holdeth me for a foe" in I'crsc 10 is taken from Chapter xiii. 24, or from Chapter xix. 11; and Verse II is taken straight from Chapter xiii. 27. The force of fairness could no farther go; and we cannot be surprised that Job sits silent, and by his silence assents to Elihu's summary as a fair and adequate statement of his argument.

And yet, though Elihu states the argument with such careful and anxious impartiality, this is not the argument which he at once proceeds to meet. Its implied charge against the injustice of God and the worthlessness of human virtue he leaves to be discussed in his second and third discourses. And, therefore, having prepared the way for that discussion, he proceeds to handle a nearer and easier charge. For, throughout his Argument, Job had also implied and asserted God's indifference—that He would not speak to men, would not listen and reply to him, and had besought Him to abandon an indifference so cruel, to hear and to speak. Even in his last Monologue Job had complained, "I cry to thee, and thou answerest

me not" (Chap. xxx. 20), and sighed in despair, "O that the Almighty would hear me!" (Chap. xxxi. 35.)

In all this, replies Elihu, still preserving his accent of surprise, in your whole contention you are unwise and unjust (large 12), as I will shew you. God is not inequitable. The righteous man is the better for his righteousness. And God does speak to men in divers ways. He is too great to dispute with you, indeed, to come at your call, to defend Himself against the vaunts of one who can only vindicate himself by accusing Him. How (large 13) could you be so unwise as to contend against Him, to affront Him by affirming, that of none of his dealings would He give account? Was that the way to make Him speak? And how (large 14) could you be so unjust? It is not true that He gives no account of Himself and of his dealings with men. He speaks to them in more ways than one.

Two, nay, three (Comp. *Verses* 14, 29) of these ways Elihu proceeds to specify.

First, God quickens men to thought and moral emotion in the silence and slumber of the night; deep religious intuitions and yearnings take form in visions (*I cross* 15 18). Then, should these fail of their proper effect, He chastens and corrects men with pain, leaving them to learn the evil of their doings from the evils they produce (*Verses* 19–22). And then, if even these should fail, He sends a messenger—man or spirit—to interpret their thoughts and emotions to them, to explain the meaning and purpose of the painful experiences through which they have passed, to convince them that the way of righteousness is the way of life and peace (*Verses* 23, 24). And all these methods of instruction and correction are sent in love, not in wrath;

with a view to teach men their duty and incline them to do it; to restore their uprightness, and so to bring back light and joy into their life (*Verses* 25-30).

The first method of Divine Approach is through the Gate of Dreams. No doubt the special reference of Verse 15 is to such ominous and oracular visions as that which shook the soul of Eliphaz with its revelation of the holiness of God and of the frailty of man (Chap. iv. 12-24), visions which, as we saw when studying that passage, while they resolve the doubts over which men have been brooding, are hardly to be distinguished from the movements of their own unaided consciousness, and are at times simply the products of the conscious spirit when freed, by slumber, from the chains of will and habit and prejudice. By such solemn visitations as these God has in all ages "uncovered the ear" of men otherwise deaf to his instructions, and scaled, or stamped, on their minds the special admonition of which they stood in need (Verse 16); or-for this may be the force of the image—conveyed to them, in this sealed and private way, the confidential hint or warning He wished them to receive. But many a lesser man than Eliphaz, many a man to whom no solemn and stately vision has been vouchsafed, has nevertheless discovered, when deep sleep has fallen upon him, in dreams and visions of the night, that

> His conscience has a thousand several tongues, And every tongue brings in a several tale, And every tale condemns him for . . .

a sinner. The pageantry and the pursuing voices of a quickened conscience—acting more fully when slumber has relaxed the will—have often been a sufficient punishment for a crime against the majesty of con-

science; and sometimes at least they have sufficed to withdraw men from an evil course on which they had entered, or were about to enter, shattering all the obstinate defences of the pride which disposed them to complete a course of folly and sin simply because they had commenced it (*Verse* 17). "To hide his pride from him" seems to be a peculiar expression for wearying a man of his pride, making him sick of the self-confidence by which he has so often been betrayed. And the Divine purpose in this method of speaking to the soul is most merciful and kindly; for God thus speaks to men, not to affright and punish them simply, but to save them from the perdition to which, in their arrogance and folly, they are hastening on (*Verse* 18).

Nor is his purpose less kind and merciful when He adopts the second method of approach, when He speaks to men by pain, when he corrects and chastens them through suffering. The very form of the opening phrase of Verse 19—"Or he is chastened with pain "-hints at the merciful intention expressly declared in Verse 18 and fully wrought out in Verses 24 30. And it is important that we should notice from the first how Elihu harps on this string, touching it again and again, as if it were familiar to his finger. For his conviction of the scope and function of affliction, and indeed of the final intention of the whole circle of the Divine rule and revelation in all the variety of its forms, differs radically from that of the Friends, who held all suffering to be punitive, and evidently conceived of God as more bent on exacting honour and obedience than on shewing lovingkindness and tender mercy. So far, therefore, from contributing nothing to the argument of the Poem, besides the large and obvious contributions to it already pointed out, Elihu's fundamental assumptions, the very axioms of his theology, are of themselves an immense advance on all we have heretofore met.

In his exposition of the first method of Divine instruction, Elihu probably had Eliphaz in his eye; in expounding the second method it is all but certain that he had Job in his eye. For in describing the man who suffers that he may be strong (Verses 19-22), he puts in strokes borrowed from Job's own diagnosis of the symptoms of his loathsome and fatal disease. His ideal sufferer is one who-besides that common sign of sickness, a loathing for wholesome and even for delicate food—"writheth in great agony;" or, as some render it, is chastened "with the constant tumult of his limbs;" whose "flesh wasteth out of sight," while "his bones, once unseen, stand out to view," so that "his soul draws nigh to the grave," and "his life to the angels of death," i.e., to the angels commissioned to slay him unless he repent. No one can well doubt whence these details were drawn who remembers how Job had sighed, "I waste away!" "My limbs are a shadow!" "My leanness beareth witness against me!" "M1 bones ourn with heat!" "I loathe my life!" "My breath is spent! My days are extinct! For me the tomb!"

But is there no hope even for such a sufferer as this? Oh, yes; for there is no school in which men learn so much, or so fast, as in the school of suffering; there is no experience by which the soul is so purged and chastened as by the experience of pain and loss. The Divine rebuke is as the ploughing up of the hardened

and weed-stained soil that it may bring forth more and better fruit.

O then we bring forth weeds When our quick minds lie still; but our ills told us Is as our earing.

And, moreover, God has a third way in which He draws near to men (Verses 23, 24). And as he describes this third method of instruction, it may be that Elihu, who has already generalized the experience of Job and of Eliphaz, turns his eye upon himself. For he himself had been moved and taught by God. The deep "conviction" to which he is now giving utterance was, as he more than once insists (Chap. xxxii. 8; Chap. xxxiii. 4). an "inspiration" from above. And this inspiration, this new interpretation of the facts of human life, probably came to him through one of the thousand "messengers" whom God employs to "shew man what is right" and true. But while he claims a Divine teaching and inspiration for himself, Elihu does not claim to be favoured above his fellows. On the contrary, he expressly argues that a similar teaching is vouchsafed to all who prepare themselves for it by "minding spiritual things." God has "a thousand" interpreters, or ways of interpreting his will to men. He is for ever sending messengers to us, not only to "tell us of our ills," but also to explain and enforce the moral intuitions which take form in our "visions," and in the admonitions of sorrow and loss. These messengers come to all, and come with the same end in view-to shew us what is right, and to pour the light and peace of Heaven on our darkened and distracted hearts.

This seems to be the fair and natural sense of *Verses* 23 and 24.

Even grave and sober Commentators, however, have found in these Verses I the whole mystery of Redemption. In the "angel" of Verse 23 they see "the Angel of the Presence," "the Angel of Jehovah;" and in the "ransom" of Verse 24 "the Sacrifice of the Cross;" and hence they attribute to Elihu at least some "prevision" of the great "mystery of godliness." Such a method of interpretation is, in my judgment, forced and unnatural. To make Elihu in any degree conversant with the propitiation and mediation of Christ is a mere anachronism, and an anachronism rebuked by the plain and obvious sense of the passage itself and of the meaning and intention of the Chapter in general. The word here rendered "angel" expresses the office or function of the angel, and means "messenger," "interpreter," "ambassador," "teacher," "prophet;" it covers any and all, mortal or immortal, whose duty it is to announce and explain and enforce the will of a superior; and therefore it covers the work and function of the man of genius and the man of science as well as those of the prophet or the evangelist, of the learned divine or faithful expositor of the Word. Any man who can "shew" his fellows "what is right" and fair and good is an "angel" in the sense in which that word is used here. And the phrase, "One out of a thousand," implies how many such ministers God has at his command; for "thousand" stands for any vast,

Ist da für ihn der Engel, der Fürsprecher, der Ein von den Tausend, das er dem Menschen was recht ist vorkünde. Und erbarmt sich der und spricht: "erlöse ihn, dass er nicht in die Grabe fahre, ich fand ein Sühne!"

 $^{^{\}star}$ In these difficult and much disputed Verses I follow Gesenius and Schlottmann in the main, though not without some slight variations. Schlottmann translates the passage thus—

indefinite number; and "one out of a thousand" is not one who in a thousand has no peer, but one whose fellows are every whit as good as he, any one of the great company of teachers and interpreters being competent for the work.

Equally clear in its bearing on these Verses is the general course of thought. The aim of Elihu is, as we have seen, to shew that God has at least three ways of teaching men the truths which lead them, through repentance, to life—the way of vision, the way of experience, the way of revelation or of inspiration. If, taught in any or in all these ways, they see "what is right" and embrace it; if, forsaking their sins, they follow after that which is good, then God delivers them from the death which their sins had provoked. This seems to be the natural and unforced order of thought in the Chapter; and to read into it the substance of the Gospel and make Elihu conversant with the Sacrifice and Intercession of "the Man from Heaven" is to attribute as much more to him than he deserves, as those critics ascribe less who can see nothing in him but a bombastic braggart or a chattering and conccited coxcomb.

By this various Divine teaching—which in its largest sense may be expressed by the words, Intuition, Experience, Revelation—man, if he profit by it, is made a new creature; he is restored to health both of body and of soul (*Verses* 25, 26); his youth is renewed; he becomes "as a little child;" and, like a child, he speaks with God as with a Father, looking up into his face with "cries of joy," because He has "restored his uprightness" to him, *i.e.*, made him really upright and pure.

Verses 27 and 28 give us the pathetic song of the restored and grateful Penitent. In the word "chant" (Verse 27) there is doubtless an allusion to the raised and measured tone of Oriental worship. The Mussulmans recite their suras and the Hindoos their shastras in a chant; and thus in India the verbs "sing" and "read" are, in the common parlance, interchangeable: a native, for instance, will often say of a bird that "it reads finely." So that we are to conceive of the penitent as coming before the Lord to make a public confession both of his sin and of the mercy which is "more than all our sins." Verses 29 and 30 do but throw the experience of the individual penitent into a general form (hence the repetition of Verse 28 in Verse 30), and assure us that it is no particular and special instance of the gracious discipline of Heaven merely to which Elihu has drawn our thoughts, but God's common method with man, the aim and intention of his discipline for us all.

Thus, as I have already pointed out, Elihu does not simply meet Job's contention that God does not and will not speak to men even when they most need and desire to hear his voice; he also meets Job's feeling that it is cruel and unjust to afflict men who have not provoked punishment by conscious and specific sins. Like the Friends, Job was unable to see that suffering had any but a punitive errand, and could only conclude that, since he was so heavily afflicted, it was God's intention to punish and even to destroy him. No, replies Elihu; affliction is sent for teaching and discipline as well as for punishment, in mercy as well as

¹ See Heber's *India*, vol. i. p. 133.

in wrath. And since you have not been guilty of the specific sins of which your sufferings would have been the natural and inevitable results, the end for which you have been afflicted *must* be your instruction and discipline in righteousness. God's aim is not to bring you down to death, but to bring you back from death, that you may live and behold the light.

And as we listen to this "wise young man" we are at first disposed to say, These were the very truths Job needed and longed to hear. And yet, were they? Though Elihu tacitly admits Job to be innocent of the gross and patent transgressions "running before to judgment," with which he had been charged by the Friends, does he not at the same time assume that Job had unconsciously committed sins of a more inward and secret kind, and that there was in him a latent sinfulness of nature for or from which God was chastening him? Is it not clearly his leading aim to convince Job of sin, if not of sins, to induce contrition, to persuade him to take up the song of the penitent, and confess, "I have sinned, and perverted that which was right"?

No doubt Job felt, as we feel, the immense difference in the tone taken by Elihu and that which the Friends had taken—felt how much more just, temperate, and kindly it was, felt that in response to such an invitation as this he would very gladly confess his sins, if only he had any specific sins to confess. But may he not also have felt that, in assuming his sins, or even his sinfulness, Elihu was doing him some injustice, and seeking to wrest from him that consciousness of integrity which he had resolved to hold fast so long as he lived?

That he was touched and torn by some such conflicting emotions as these seems implied in the closing

paragraph of the Chapter (Verses 31-33). For in these Verses, as the Commentators generally agree, the effect of Elihu's discourse on Job is indirectly pourtrayed. He may have stirred, or lifted a hand, or opened his lips, as if about to reply to the argument of Elihu, as if to demand proof of the sins which he was summoned to repent and confess, or to deny that in his case suffering had been a school of righteousness. But feeling that "this earlier Daniel come to judgment" had really imported a new element into the discussion, and touched with his tender and sympathetic tone, as also with his frank and obvious desire to repel the charges of the Friends, and to "find him innocent," he may have checked himself, and pressed back the rising words, resolute to hear him to the end. This at least appears to be the implication of the challenge, and of the pauses of Elihu in the last three Verses of the Chapter, and of the unbroken silence of Tob.

The most important contribution to the arguments of the Poem made in Elihu's First Discourse are the two on which already so much stress has been laid.

(1) That suffering is intended by God as a quickening and loving discipline in righteousness, rather than as an angry and vindictive punishment; that though "adversity be like the period of the former and latter rain—cold, comfortless, and unfriendly to man—yet from that season have their birth the flower and the fruit, the date, the rose, and the pomegranate." And (2) that by the great primitive religious intuitions, which all men share, revealed and expressed in visions, by their common training in the school of suffering, and by the due interpretation of this expe-

rience and these intuitions, conveyed through the wisdom of the wise or the inspiration of God, every man receives a sufficient disclosure of the Divine love to bring him to repentance and to "the light of life." And if Elihu had not added another word, if we owed him nothing but this striking, complete, and wonderfully philosophic definition of the common and constant modes in which God reveals to men the eternal counsels of his will, we should be compelled to confess that he makes a very real and valuable contribution to the argument of the Poem, a contribution as real and valuable to-day as on the day it left his lips.

S. COX.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. CHAPTER I.

Verses 1, 2.—Paul, by the will of God, an Apostle of Jesus Christ. The Writer was accustomed to refer his apostolate to the gracious purpose of the Father (see commencement of the Epistles to Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Galatians i. 15, 16). This deep conviction justified the use of a stronger and peculiar phrase in 1 Timothy i. 1. (κατ' ἐπιταγήν Θεοῦ), one which referred explicitly to the direct "appointment" and authoritative commission in which the Divine "Will" expressed itself. According to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus. The old interpreters paraphrased the preposition thus, "so as to preach;" and several of the modern commentators deem that κατά here means, "with a view to the proclamation of" the promise of life.²

¹ Theodoret, ώστε με κηρέξαι.

⁻ Huther, Mack, Ellicott, and others. For this use of κατά, see 2 Cor. xi. 21.

This is a noble account to give of the gospel, "a promise of life:" it sets forth the seat, the quality, and the guarantee of the promise—"Christ Jesus;" and it limits, ennobles, and characterizes the apostolate as an office the function of which is to make known or to proclaim this promise. To (my) beloved child [charissimo filio, Vulg. Timothy, grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord. The change of phrase from "very own child" (γνησίω) to "very dear, or beloved, child," has led Mack and Alford to suppose that Timothy had forfeited the dearer and more intimate phrase by some moral infirmity. Huther, Fairbairn, and Ellicott repudiate the inference. And whatever suggestion to that effect may arise in any other portion of the Epistle, we cannot think that there is any place for it here. On the contrary, the epithet used in the First Epistle implies an organic, metaphorically physical, relation, which could not change or suffer modification. The term used here, "beloved," might, on the other hand, have been more easily forfeited, but it was not. The salutation in the three Pastoral Epistles introduces between the customary "grace" and "peace" the additional idea of "mercy." It is a touching indication of the Apostle's own humility, and reveals his deepening sense of the need of "mercy" as he drew near the glory of the unveiled Face. It records the fact that if in Ephesus, Rome, or England there are any children of God who fancy they can rise above an utterance of the cry, "God be merciful to me," apostles and ministers of Christ, even in view of the martyr's crown, cannot forget their profound need of Divine "mercy." The association of Christ Jesus with God the Father as the common source of "grace," "mercy," and "peace," shews what St. Paul thought of his Lord. As he commenced his Epistle with this blended benediction, we are not surprised to find that his last recorded words were, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." This was the sum of all blessedness, and the exalted Lord, Christ, was Himself the source of it.

Verse 3.—I give thanks to God, whom I serve: -the word here used for "serve" is used in Attic Greek for free, willing service, and even for bought and arbitrary service, and also occasionally for service rendered to the gods; though the proper word for the latter in classical Greek is a different one. I Yet latrcia occurs in the Apocrypha and New Testament between twenty and thirty times, to express the worship due and the homage paid to Almighty God. This circumstance will govern its use here, and limit its application rather to the sentiment and spirit than to the method or form of the service. From my forefathers; some have here given to ἀπό the sense of "desisting from," "separating myself from;" but it undoubtedly indicates what has been to him the source and origin of the sentiments in question. If so, the Apostle is merely giving expression to the unity of the object of Divine worship under both covenants. This reverence for the religion of his fathers is in contrast with the spirit of jealous anti-Hebraic animosity and of violent iconoclasm, which infected the Gentile Church; and it is also condemnatory of a similar disposition in the present day to break with the past. The one living and

^{*} θεραπεύειν not λατρεύειν.

true God was revealed alike to Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles. Paul was not conscious of worshipping another God, or of having suffered any discontinuity, or change of mind as to the central object of all religious homage, even though in the way that some called heresy he worshipped the God of his fathers. I He did this in pure conscience. A "pure conscience" is not so comprehensive a term as a "good conscience," which means one either educated and active, or vigorous and approving. A pure conscience is one neither injured by moral defilement, cauterized by bad habits, nor blinded by perverse education. There is much reason to believe that St. Paul suffered for years from a condemning conscience, which was nevertheless "pure." "When the commandment came sin revived;" the law condemned him, and plunged him in despair. He strove to have a "conscience void of offence towards God and men." "From his forefathers he served God in pure conscience;" but, while using this phrase, he seems to confess that his conscience, just because it was "pure," was not in this sense "good." 2 His conscience did not approve, but all along condemned him. The "purity" of his motive, and the sincerity of his desire to obey and love the God of his fathers, revealed all the plague of his own heart, and terrified him with Divine judgments.

Since, or seeing that, I make unceasing, or uninterrupted, mention concerning thee in my prayers by night and by day. This mode of translating the $\dot{\omega}_{S}$ is practically that of Heydenreich, and equivalent to the "as" of Ellicott and the "quoniam" or "quippe" of Winer.

¹ Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 6, 7.

² Cf. I Tim. i. 5, 19; iii. 9, and THE EXPOSITOR, vol. ii. p. 67.

Luther, Davidson, Fairbairn, Mack, Lange, prefer "wie" or "as:" and all differ from the interpretation of Chrysostom, and the translation of the Vulgate, "qued," which regards the és as equivalent to őti, "that." The importunity of Paul's prayers for Timothy could not have been the occasion of his solemn thanksgiving to God. The clause is parenthetical, and denotes the affectionate frame of mind, the continuous interest, which tends to justify in Paul's eyes his own burst of honest gladness when information reached him of Timothy's entire consistency of character and profession.

Verse 4.—Eagerly longing to see thee, remembering thy tears, that I might be filled with joy. This clause is a continuation of the parenthetical explanation of his state of mind: and it contains one of the chief strains of the Epistle. St. Paul in his last hours had a passionate desire to see his "beloved child." The parting of these two had been bitter. If the Apostle had been torn away from Timothy by some sudden surprise, and if shaken and convulsed by the blast of persecution, Timothy had wept despairing tears, and appeared too weak to breast the violence of the tempest alone, then the constancy of Paul's prayer for him, and his eager desire to grasp his hand, and to see his face once more, were all natural, human, and entirely characteristic; while they give significance to the veritable ground and occasion of thanksgiving, which was, in that I have received a reminder of 1 the unfeigned faith that is in thee. We cannot determine the nature of "the reminder," nor how it reached the Apostle; whether by

^{*} It may mean "have called to remembrance." *Cf.* analogous expression, 2 Pet. i. 9. But the word ὑπόμνησις reports the transitive force of ὑπομιμνήσκω "to call to mind." 'Αναμιμνήσκω, with ἀνάμνησις, refers to the subjective "calling to remembrance," or remembering.

the lips of Onesiphorus, or by letter, or by any other means of communication. Some recorded circumstance, some spoken words, some searching test, had convinced St. Paul that Timothy at the present time was shedding no womanish tears, that his faith had revealed its strength and reality. If put to a severe strain, there was now no mistake about it. His faith was not a mask of unbelief, nor a mere species of personal affection for the Apostle, nor was it an unpractical faith or one dependent on circumstances.1 St. Paul may once have entertained some transient doubt about Timothy. His fears may have exaggerated to himself the significance of Timothy's excessive grief. The words of despair wrung from his lips at their parting may have distressed the Apostle; but now the ugly suspicion is suppressed, and no longer haunts his nightly intercession. He goes back to the beginning of his intercourse with Timothy: a faith such as (\$\tilde{\eta}_{\text{ts}}\$) dwelt first in thy grandmother 2 Lois and thy mother Eunike, but I (have been and) am convinced is also in thee. The hostile critics think this to be an unsuitable reference for the dying Apostle to have made to a long and trusted companion and friend. But nothing is more common than for old men to remind the young of their earliest and first associations with themselves: or for them to hark back to the memories of parents and ancestors. The mother of Timothy is mentioned in Acts xvi. 1 as "believing." Origen conjectured that

¹ The same epithet, "unfeigned," is applied to love (Rom. xii. 9), and to heavenly wisdom (James iii. 17). *Cf.* I Tim. i. 5, and THE EXPOSITOR, vol. ii. p. 68.

² The classical word is $\tau'\eta\theta\eta$ or $\tau'\iota\tau\theta\eta$, and is equal to the word $\mu\acute{a}\mu\mu$ a, the mother of either father or mother.

Lois and Eunike were relatives of St. Paul. This is only conjecture. There is far more reason for believing that they were converts made by him on his first visit to Lystra. In the Jewish communities of these Asiatic towns there were elect souls who had begun to cherish larger hopes for humanity. If Lois had permitted her daughter to marry a Greek, and yet had retained her faith in the promises made to Israel; and if Eunike had so far vielded to her husband's views or habits, as to have foregone for her only son the sacramental rite of admission to the Jewish nation, and yet, notwithstanding this, had diligently instructed him in the history and contents of Holy Scripture (Chap. iii. 15), we have a glimpse of light thrown upon the synagogues and homes of devout Israelites in Asia Minor. The piety and consistency of young Timothy was spoken of on all sides, while the transfer of the trio from the synagogue to the Church, from the faith of their fathers to the faith of Christ, had been rapid, painless, and sincere. Faith "dwelt" in these pious women. They had its beginnings in their hearts, before the glad news reached them. They accepted the promise of life in Christ Jesus. They moved on "from faith to faith;" and Paul is "persuaded" that the womanly intensity of their godly confidence and simple trust had passed like holy fire into the breast of Timothy. It dwelt first in them, and then revealed itself in him. Like the celebrated mothers of Augustine, of Chrysostom, of Basil, and of other illustrious saints of God, their life, their sincerity and constancy, became vicariously a glorious heritage of the universal Church.

Verse 6.—For which cause I (because I am persuaded and convinced anew that thy faith is genuine) I put thee in remembrance, to kindle the glowing embers 2 of the gift of God, which is in thee by the laying on of my hands. "The gift of God," like a live coal from the altar, was not extinguished, but yet it might be smouldering. Though St. Paul does not imply that Timothy's peculiar gift had been ever quenched, yet he urges him to give great heed to the fire in his own heart, to wake and feed the flame of holy love. Dean Alford unduly presses the expression in proof of the tremulous character of Timothy's faith. I think, with Chrysostom, Bengel, Huther, and many others, we ought not to infer more than that Timothy's work had suffered through his despondency arising from the peril and imprisonment of his master. He may have been ready to despair of the Church. A grief like that of Albrecht Dürer, when he heard of the imprisonment of Luther, may have filled Timothy's heart. The special charisma needed, therefore, in his case was παρρησιά, or a clear, bold utterance of the faith that was in him. Yet from timidity or morbid modesty the young man may have restrained his speech. Who does not need to have his gifts quickened, his powers replenished and stimulated, by full and fresh co-operation of his will with Divine grace? St. Paul has passed from prayer to exhortation. It is not enough that Timothy should receive the Holy Spirit; it is incumbent upon him "to stir up," to rekindle, to concentrate anew upon his work the sacred flame that had been lighted within

¹ Cf. for the like Greek expression, v. 12; Tit. i. 13.

² 'Αναζωπυρέω is used here only in the New Testament, but it is found in this sense, I Macc. xiii. 7. Josephus often uses it, so does Clem. Rom. I Ep. ad Corin. c. 27, and Ignat. ad Eph. c. I.

him. Paul speaks here of the *charisma* being communicated by the laying on of his own hands.¹ In I Timothy iv. 14 the "laying on of hands" is referred to the presbyters generally, among whom, without doubt, St. Paul had regarded himself as conspicuous and pre-eminent.

Many ecclesiastical writers have gathered from this phrase the doctrine of the sacrament of orders, and even the indelibility of such orders.² Augustine taught that "though God gives grace, He always bestows it through man." A great truth is contained in this utterance, though it is one which is sadly obscured, if it be made to sustain the idea that Divine grace is limited by sacramental channels or restricted to physical contact.

The simple ceremony of *chcirothesia* dates back to far earlier times, and was an expressive symbol of mutual confidence, of paternal benediction, of earnest supplication. It is candidly admitted that our Lord laid his hands on little children and blessed them. The Apostles appointed "the seven" evangelists as "deacons" to their earliest duties by some such rite; yet it is worthy of note that they did not by this act confer upon the seven the power, in their turn, to bestow similar privileges, or to impart the Holy Spirit. This is evident, because when Philip, one of the seven, had baptized numerous Samaritans, he found that his ordination had not given him the authority to confer upon his converts the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For this purpose Peter and John went down

¹ See The Expositor, vol. ii. p. 209.
² Mack in loco.
³ Gen. xlviii. 14–16.
⁴ Matt. xix. 13; Luke xviii. 15.

from Jerusalem to Samaria.¹ An obscure Damascene convert, Ananias, was specially commissioned to baptize and lay hands upon Saul of Tarsus,² and at a later period the *Church* at Antioch laid hands on Saul and Barnabas, and thus designated them to their great commission.³

Cheirothesia by the Apostles was, moreover, accompanied by the conference of miraculous energies upon the Church. These manifestations were the signs of their own apostolic commission, and were claimed as such by St. Paul. If hierarchic imposition of hands were now accompanied by signs following, by instantaneous possession of virtues, capacities, heroism, or a fine and sacred spirit, the inference might be drawn from effect to cause. Miracles, however, which are wrought in regions whither observation cannot track them, and whose only guarantee is the word of the administrator, are deprived of every test by which they can be verified as such.

Verse 7.—For God gave us not the spirit of cowardice. We surely have here a delicate hint of the genuineness of the Epistle, and not, as De Wette and Dr. Davidson suggest, a blundering imitation, by a falsarius, of Romans viii. 15. He who wrote, "We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear," now excludes all unworthy trembling in the face of duty, as any sign of the indwelling Spirit of the exalted Christ. But, he adds, God gave us the spirit of power, love, and selfcontrol. Power is opposed to unhealthy or paralyzing fears. The spirit of "power" resists evil, endures pain, rules men, encounters death; but "love" must temper "power." The angel of this very Church of Ephesus

¹ Acts viii. 17.

² Ibid. ix. 17.

was subsequently ready to act with stringency, to resist evil and to labour unto weariness without collapse, and yet he had "forgotten his first love." In the blending of "power" and "love" the mind needs, moreover, the balancing force of self-control. The Spirit of God by supplying us with power and love launches within us forces which are capable, if they are not well adjusted, of producing either arrogance or laxity; and which need, therefore, the central controlling energy of true self-mastery to harmonize them and save them from mutual destruction. We do not desiderate a neutral, colourless result, but a higher perfection, one in which both these forces have full play.

Verse 8. Be not thou therefore (as many of our old companions seem to be) ashamed of the testimony thou art called upon to bear concerning our Lord (the phrase might mean Christ's testimony to Himself, though this would be somewhat far-fetched), nor be thou ashamed of me his prisoner. St. Paul's loyalty to the Lord had been the cause of both his imprisonments. Here commentators differ as to whether the rebuke is implied that Timothy had already been chargeable with shame-facedness and fear. All that can be safely inferred is that he needed this warning. St. Paul would hardly have used these words in addressing Titus or Epaphras. But, on the other hand, suffer hardship along with (me),4

¹ See Rev. ii. 2, 4.

² See Archbishop Trench's "Synonyms of the New Testament," \S 20, on $ai\tilde{c}\omega g$ and $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\sigma\sigma\tilde{c}\nu\eta$, in which he urges that the latter is a great heathen virtue, not much insisted on in the New Testament, because submission to a higher Spirit has taken the place of a lofty independence of the human spirit. Many lexicons give for $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\tilde{c}\nu\iota\sigma g$ and $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\sigma\nu\iota\sigma\mu\tilde{c}g$, from $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\sigma\nu\iota\tilde{c}\omega$, the transitive sense of admonition, and (Alford) it would yield a good sense here; but the usage of the word is in favour of an intransitive or reflexive sense, the process by which one may make one's self $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\omega\nu$.

³ Cf. iv. 10, 12.

⁴ Cf. Phil. i. 27.

for the gospel (do not sever your interests from mine), in accordance with the power of God (for within your own will, you will not find the motive or the energy equal to this great emergency), who saved us and called us with a holy calling. "Salvation" is God's work, and embraces the twofold result of deliverance from the consequences of sin and transformation into a new and Divine manhood. It goes deeper still. We need a holy and heavenly calling to summon us from our death-sleep, to direct our conscience, to build up our character, and reveal our special duty. The Father God is always spoken of as the originator of this "call." God called us not according to our works, either foreseen, or accomplished, or predetermined, but according to his own (personal) purpose and grace given to us in Christ Jesus before the eternal periods. The "grace" and "purpose" are separately mentioned. The "purpose" issues in the "grace which is given." I do not think that Christ Jesus is here represented as the vicarious object of the grace, or as receiving before the eternal ages this great gift for us. The Son of God was the object of the eternal love of God; but the use of the phrase "Christ Jesus" points to the fact of the incarnation of the "eternal Son." The purposes of God in eternity concerning the gift of grace in Christ Jesus are as good as if they had been realized in time.2

Verse 10.—Before the eternal periods, and during their succession and evolution, the purpose was not carried into effect, nor its character displayed. The Father's grace waited for the fulness of the ages in order to be accomplished, or to realize itself in human consciousness, and it has now been manifested through the appearing of

¹ See Gal. i. 6; I Cor. i. c.

our Saviour Yesus Christ.1 By the incarnation of the eternal Son of God in the Saviour Christ, the eternal purpose and grace of the Father became an object of contemplation and confidence. The "grace" may have made other, greater or less, displays of itself in other worlds. In former ages, moreover, flashes of light may have shone into human hearts from the same Divine source; but in the historic Jesus it was made manifest to this and all worlds.2 Our Lord Christ was the most explicit, abundant, complete, and satisfying revelation of the eternal purpose of Almighty God. The Apostle then adds a clause of transcendent and supreme importance, which is not without interest in estimating the entire philosophy of the writer. Christ Jesus is not only a living embodiment of the eternal purpose and love of the Father, but He is also declared to be the Saviour who made death of none effect, abolished or rendered inoperative that death which is the universal curse of man, which "has passed through upon all men," 3 and is grimly symbolized to us in the dissolution of the body. The Lord declared that those who lived and believed in Him should never die. St. John+ could never have recorded these words of the Master. when a whole generation of Christians, including all the Apostles, with the exception of himself, had passed away and come under the tyrannous sway of the last enemy, unless he had supposed the words to imply something far more and other than the death of the body. Wiesinger, Huther, Ellicott, and others are

¹ 'Επιφαίνω, in classical writers, means ''to shew openly," ''to shed light upon.'' In Tit, ii. II, and iii. 4, it is used of the grace of God, and of the manifestation of the Christ. 'Έπιφάνεια, in 2 Thess. i. 8, and I Tim. vi. I4, is used for the further and final unveiling of the person and character of the Lord. $\Sigma \omega \tau i \rho$ is here used of Christ (cf. Tit. i. I, and iii. 4, where it is used of God).

² Ephes. iii. 10. ³ Rom. v. 12.

⁴ John xi. 26.

right in understanding by the word θάνατος "death," the entire antithesis to $\zeta\omega\dot{\eta}$, or "life." Surely it is the entire principle of decay, corruption, and separation from God instituted by sin. It includes all the animosity that a living self-conscious being feels against God for bringing him into a dying world, all the resistance to and departure from his supreme will. It is this otherwise irremediable curse, and painful looking for of condign punishment, this moral death and dissolution, which Christ has disarmed and rendered inoperative. The sting of death is extracted by the incarnate Son. Elsewhere Paul spoke of a future when death, the last enemy, is made of none effect, is done away (καταργεῖται); I but as he drew near to his own dissolution, he spoke of death as already done away (καταργήσαντος), and not only so, but Christ has poured light upon life and incorruption. Heydenreich explains this, "has brought the hope of immortality into distinct consciousness;" but it is more than this. The Apostle refers to the illumination which Christ has bestowed on "life." The "eternal life" was manifested, and the Apostles saw it, in its dazzling glory and true significance, in the person of the Holy One.2 This was seen to have in itself the quality of indestructibility. So intense, sublime, perfect was this life, that men felt as they had never felt before that He at least could not die. He possessed, like the Father, "life in Himself," 3 and He claimed the power to impart it to others; 4 and living men knew that they possessed in and with Him eternal life. 5 Streams and floods of light poured from Him upon "incorruptibility." His

¹ I C x, xv. 26. ² John i, 1–3, ³ Ibid, i, 4; v. 26. ⁴ Ibid, x, 28. ⁵ I John v. 13.

life and his resurrection from the grave revealed the conditions of true blessedness, and also the prospect of eternal continuity for both body and spirit.

Some writers have deduced from the passage that there was no recognition of life or of resurrection before Christ. This is not true historically, nor does St. Paul go to this length. He expressly says that Christ, as the complete manifestation of the eternal purpose of God, illuminated life and incorruptibility. Davidson says that the clause, through the Gospel, is an un-Pauline addition. But compare Romans i. 16. The "Gospel" is the concave mirror by which the light of Christ's life is thrown upon the individual who craves the illumination. The Gospel is the form in which the objective revelation made in the person and work of the Lord becomes a matter of consciousness, both transferrible and transmissible to others. As a life-giving word, the Gospel was "quick and powerful, and sharper than the two-edged sword." The apostolic call did but secure the world-wide utterance of "the promise of life" (see Verse 2).

Verse II.—For the proclamation of which Gospel I I was appointed a herald and apostle and teacher of the nations. An ambassador of a kingly message, a representative and witness of the risen Christ, and a teacher of those who had been left in the darkness of nature and the shadow of death. The hostile critics assert the unsuitable, superfluous, and unnatural character of this assertion. They say St. Paul would not have reiterated this fundamental fact in his final correspondence with Timothy. I cannot detect any such qualities in the assertion. The letter, if genuine, was written from the

prison of the Apostle, to which he had been confined for the maintenance of this very position. St. Paul had suffered in popular esteem, had alienated some old friends; and even Timothy needed a little urging to come to his side in his last agony. His claim to be all this may have been questioned by some who bore the Christian name, and cliques had arisen in the society of Ephesus which might possibly need and receive a fresh accession of spiritual courage by knowing that he did not abate, still less retract, an iota of his Divine commission. They, therefore, needed this asseveration and that which follows:—

Verse 12.—For which cause (because I have received this commission), a clause already pointed out as peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles. It occurs in Titus i. 13, and v. 6, and is a common form of expression in the Acts of the Apostles. I suffer even these things, but I am not ashamed. Some historical fact, which we can only conjecture, underlies this reference. As we have already seen, Paul was first imprisoned in Rome because he had made his appeal to the imperial courts for protection from the fury of the Jerusalem bigots. Probably he was now apprehended by Roman officials on the unrighteous charge of treason. The edicts of Nero made the propagation of Christianity a crimen majestatis. He may now have been exposed to indignities from which his Roman citizenship would not shield him. When his Ephesian disciples saw him thus handled, they obviously shrank from the peril of avowing his friendship. Consequently he uttered his trumpet-peal, "I am not ashamed, though I suffer even these things;" for I know in whom I I have put my

The dative here has the simple power of ἐπι with dative.

trust (and am now confiding), and I am persuaded that He is able to guard the sacred function deposited with me unto that day. I have already discussed the three places in which this word παραθήκη occurs. Some speciality of meaning arises in each case from the context, and we need not bind ourselves to precisely the same meaning for the word on each occasion of its use. The sense of "deposit"—sacred responsibility or holy function deposited or entrusted to a servant by a master—provides a clear and good meaning in I Timothy vi. 20, and the analogous use of the word justifies itself in Verse 14. On both occasions Timothy is bidden to guard it (φυλάξαι). In this Verse the Lord Himself is said to be able to guard (δυλάξαι) the παςαθήκη; and some have plausibly contended that here it must mean something which St. Paul entrusted to God, and not something which his Lord had entrusted to him. Many attempts have been made to solve this difficulty, and either to preserve the same sense in each case, or boldly to sever this particular use of the word from its use in the other two passages. Theophylact and Beza consider that here we should take it to mean "the crown of righteousness;" Calvin, "the salvation of the soul;" Bengel, "the soul;" Alford, "body, soul, and spirit;" Wiesinger, "life and immortality." These phrases, or ideas, would all overburden the meaning in the other passages, and are not very happy solutions of the significance of the term even in this Verse. I prefer a translation which is applicable in each case, and which is substantially the interpretation of Huther, Davidson, and Ellicott. The Apostle has just said that he is a herald, an apostle and

Note on I Tim. vi. 20, THE EXPOSITOR, vol. iv. p. 211.

teacher of the Gentiles. This claim was disputed by some, and he was then in sore straits. He was, however, persuaded that the Lord would vindicate him and sustain the commission intrusted to him. The sacred function had been deposited with him, and he now restored it to his Lord. He confidently gives back the "trust" $(\pi a \rho a \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon)$ to Him who first of all had entrusted $(\pi a \rho \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon)$ it to him. He leaves it to his Master unto that day, when all secrets will be revealed, when every vain suspicion or disloyal surmise concerning the Master as well as himself will be dissolved in the brightness of his coming.

Verse 13.—Hold—not necessarily "hold fast" (exe is not katexe), nor is it emphatic,—"retain," or simply "have," the form, type, or expression of health-giving words which thou heardest from me. This need not be a compendium, a catechism, or confession of faith, nor need it be some one particular "faithful saying," but the entire type of teaching with which Timothy had been familiar in his intercourse with the Apostle; in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus, the two fundamental graces which draw their virtue from, and find their full sphere of united exercise in, Christ Jesus.

Verse 14.—Guard, through the Holy Spirit, the goodly (excellent, lovely, beautiful) function deposited with thee. St. Paul does not hand his commission over to Timothy. That could not be. He restores this to his Lord. But Timothy has a special function of his own. St. Paul had spoken life-giving words to him. Let Timothy treasure them in faith and love. They define his duty and his special commission. Let him hold them as an inspiration. Let him guard them as a trust. The Holy Spirit be his helper. So in all Christian service now,

the continued effort to realize the Divine help of the Holy Spirit is the surest way to be faithful and obedient to the heavenly calling. Another proof of the prophetic mission of the Christian ministry.

Verse 13. - Thou knowest this, that all they who are in Asia, of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes, have turned away from me. I St. Paul adds this as a reason for Timothy's faithfulness. The strength and vehemence of the phrase reveal a sad and dark experience. It surely cannot mean, as many urge, that all St. Paul's friends in proconsular Asia had deserted his cause. Some limitation of such a sweeping remark is necessitated by the next verse and by Chapter iv. 16. The Greek expositors explained it to mean all Asiatics now in Rome. This idea would have required ἀπο or ἐκ, rather than &. Many expositors suppose it to refer to those Ephesians who had accompanied him to Rome, and in terror or treachery had deserted him, and now returned to Asia. I am inclined to think that he is not speaking of Christian people as such, but of public opinion in Asia, and the Asiatic sentiment dominant in Rome. Nothing more is known of Physellus and Hermogenes. Their very mention is a hint of genuineness, and may easily refer to some incidents of St. Paul's arrest and trial, which Timothy "would know," would understand perfectly, but the details of which are now irrecoverable. The literal acceptation of the words, which is sometimes pressed by those who aggravate the conflict between St. Paul and the other Apostles, is, however, impossible, and incompatible with the whole substance of both epistles. We cannot be certain about the specific reference.

Aorist passive in middle sense, with accusative of the person.

Verses 16-18.—May the Lord grant mercy (ποιησαι έλεος is the ordinary form) 2 to the household of Onesiphorus. It has been supposed that because the household of Onesiphorus are mentioned here and in Chapter iv. that Onesiphorus had died when the letter was written. It may be so, but it is just as probable that Onesiphorus brought to Paul some tender acknowledgment of affection from the members of his own family. The father conveyed to the suffering Apostle some token of regard, some gifts and letters, which evoked his tender and special recognition. Because he ofttimes refreshed me 3 (not with physical sustenance only, but with sympathy and love) and was not ashamed of my chain. The friendship of Onesiphorus suffered no chill from the degradation, shame, and augmented rigour of his imprisonment: but when he had arrived in Rome on other business not bearing directly on St. Paul's trial, but at peril of his life, he sought me diligently + and found me. St. Paul lay hidden in some obscure dungeon difficult of access. The ruin of the public buildings of Rome by the great fire of A.D. 64 may be partially credited as the cause of this cruel aggravation of his lot. The Lord grant that he (Onesiphorus) may find mercy from the Lord in that day! The double use of κύριος has suggested that the first κύριος refers to the fulness and majesty of the Godhead and the second to Christ; but since the prominent

 $^{^{\}text{T}}\Delta \phi \eta$ here probably stands for $\delta oi\eta$. Cf. Rom. xv. 5; Eph. i. 17; iii. 16. Lachmann and Tischendorf (8th edit.) give $\delta \omega_{\mathcal{V}}$, which is probably a form of the subjunctive. Winer, G.G. (new edit.) p. 94.

 $^{^3}$ 'Ανάφυχω is used in LXX. as translation of several Hebrew words. Cf. Psa. xxxviii. 14; Judges xv. 19; Exodus xxiii. 12. It is derived from ψ ύχω, to cool with the breath.

⁴ Σπουδαίως is the reading finally preferred by Tischendorf, with \aleph , C, D, in place of σπουδαίωτερου, which ought to have been translated "more" rather than "very diligently."

thought revolves around the majestic Person who will distribute the awards of eternal justice "because He is Son of Man," 1 St. Paul prays that mercy may temper with justice the destiny of Onesiphorus in that day. The writer gives expression to his earnest wish in the formula ĉώη αὐτῶ ὁ κύριος, and he again reveals his conviction that Christ is the living Providence of his own Church, and is working by his Spirit in the minds of men. Mack argues that since Onesiphorus was dead we have an instance of an apostolic prayer for a departed soul.2 Even if it could be proved that St. Paul knew that his kind friend was dead, it could hardly be twisted into a justification of such a practice. The only ground for the hypothesis of the death of Onesiphorus appears in the further reference to his household, rather than to himself in the final salutations, Chap. iv. 19. This might easily be explained on another supposition as well as on that made by the advocates of the "prayer for the departed." If Onesiphorus of Ephesus had business in Rome, he may have had reasons for visiting Corinth, or Thessalonica, or Alexandria, or Spain, and may have been at too great a distance to receive personally the Apostle's salutations. And how many good offices he rendered in Ephesus thou knowest better3 (than I can tell thee). The reference suggests vigorous steps taken by this faithful friend on the occasion of St. Paul's arrest, to counteract the doctrinal antagonism of an Hymenæus, the personal malice of an Alexander, or the brutal severity of the representatives of the imperial court. H. R. REYNOLDS.

I John v. 27.

² The Christian Doctrine of Prayers for the Departed, by Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., p. 45, strongly urges the same interpretation.
³ The comparative is not used for the superlative.

ABRAHAM JUSTIFIED BY FAITH.

How far is theology an essential ingredient of religion? The answer to this question is less simple than it might appear. For though, on the one hand, all except the most extreme Agnostics would admit that religion implies worship, and that worship implies some knowledge of the object of worship; and though, on the other hand, very few nowadays would assert that except a man believe faithfully all the intricate technicalities of the Athanasian creed he cannot be saved, or would refuse, like David Deans, to consult a physician "if he didna satisfy me that he had a right sense of the right-hand and left-hand defections of the day," vet where to fix the minimum of dogmatic belief requisite to build religious faith upon, how to decide what is the amount of intellectual assent required for the spiritual life, is a very difficult and delicate inquiry, and one which would receive very different answers in different ages of the Church. There have been times when the assent of the intellect to dogmatic propositions was held to be the one thing needful; there have been times - perhaps the present age is amongst them when the tendency was to depreciate dogma, to dispense with creeds, and to reduce religious faith to a molluscous condition, to a body without bones. very word Faith, by the different senses in which it has been used-now for the tenacious assertion of a creed, now for the personal trust of the soul in God, and, again, for the undefinable sensations which are to some Christians the evidence and assurance of their acceptance with God, testifies to the varying importance which different theological schools have assigned

to the assent of the intellect, the affection of the heart, and the excitement of the imagination.

Of the important position of Faith in any system of religion based on the New Testament there can be no question. "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed," said our Lord, "nothing shall be impossible unto you." "Without faith it is impossible to please God," says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. man is justified by the faith of Jesus Christ," says St. Paul. And it was by bringing this principle of Justification by Faith that Luther gained the lever by which he became mighty to the throwing down of strongholds. But because Justification by Faith played so leading a part in the Reformation, because it was put forward as the test of vitality in the Church, for this very reason it soon lost its freshness and life, and became petrified into a mere article of belief. How Faith justifies -what is justifying Faith-what is the relation between Faith and works such are the questions on which volumes, nay libraries, have been written, not without the result in many cases of "darkening counsel by words without knowledge." And yet if Faith is the great requisite without which all else is vain; if works, however apparently good, that do not spring out of faith are, as theologians tell us, sinful, or at least have the nature of sin, there must surely be some kind of working definition or description of faith attainable, such as shall meet the requirements of ordinary persons living in the world, without involving the intricacies and subtleties of technical theology. It is with the hope of at least indicating the possibility of such a solution of the difficulty that I now propose to discuss St. Paul's great instance and example of saving Faith.

It is obvious why, if the chronological order was to be abandoned, the Epistle to the Romans should be placed first of St. Paul's writings. For in "this precious work," as M. Renan calls it, "the basis of Christian theology," we have not only the great authoritative statement of the Apostle's master-thought, but also the expression of a great central principle to which from time to time the Church has rallied for a fresh departure, after having temporarily lost or forsaken her bearings. That the Jew, although he had great advantages, had no exclusive privileges; that Jew and Gentile alike are included under sin, because each had fallen short of the ideal set before him, the one of the law of Moses, the other of the law of nature; that, therefore, all combined are guilty before God, and must look not to their own works or merits but to his free grace and mercy; that this grace and mercy are manifested in Jesus Christ, and that therefore man is justified by faith in Christ: in other words, that man must reach his highest development not by looking at himself, but by looking out of and above himself—this is the great Pauline doctrine set forth in the Epistle to the Romans. The Jew had thought to stand right with God by keeping the law, which soon came to mean chiefly meeting certain ceremonial and ritual requirements. Doubtless the higher and nobler minds among the Jews had preserved a true and pure morality; but with the majority "the righteousness which is of the law" had come to be little more than the observance of a burdensome and meaningless etiquette the doing of things which could not profit. And therefore St. Paul had come forward to declare that man is rated in God's judgment not by what he does, but by

what he is: that he is justified by faith without (not avev, in the absence of, but χωρίς, apart from) the deeds of the law. And so in every age, whenever men have thought to stand right with God by outward acts of whatever kind, whenever they have thought wickedly that He was even such an one as themselves, and so have sought to please Him by the same kind of means by which they would please a powerful man, it has needed a John Baptist, or a Paul, or a Luther, or a Pascal, to call them to repentance, to preach Justification by Faith, and not by works, to proclaim that righteousness is not a matter of haggling and bargaining with God, but that it is the devotion of the heart to Him. Hence Luther declared most truly that Justification by Faith is the "articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae; "becaus; when men turn righteousness into etiquette, and think that God is pleased with their works or their gifts without reference to the motive whence they spring, a principle of corruption is at work in the Church which, if it is not cut out by the roots, will poison the Christian life. But the doctrine of one age becomes the dogma of another; and technical theology has long ago laid hold of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and has analysed and defined it, until plain men have been fain to pass it by as a technicality which concerns them not -as a matter of School Divinity rather than of Religion. Let us see, then, how far the Apostle warrants this conclusion.

In writing as he did, chiefly to Jews, it was important for him to shew, if possible, that this fundamental principle of his was no novelty, but was involved in the teaching of the Old Covenant. "We have Abraham to our father" would have been the ready

answer to any teacher who proposed to bring in any new form of doctrine. "Was not Abraham our father justified by works?" is the appeal of St. James when he is setting forth the doctrine of justification under a elifferent aspect. And so when St. Paul, himself an Hebrew of the Hebrews, himself of the seed of Abraham, had asserted that God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, and that He would justify both circumcision and uncircumcision by faith, he is met by the question, "If we establish the law through faith, if faith is, after all, the basis on which the law must rest, what advantage are we to say that Abraham our father has gained in respect of the flesh? Wherein is he the better for that covenant of circumcision on which we have been taught to set so high a value?" And to this he replies, "Abraham is the first great example not only of circumcision, but also of faith. The Scripture tells us that Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. Abraham, therefore, is the father not only of the circumcision, but also of all that believe, though they be not circumcised. In exalting faith, I am, in fact, only going back to the first founder of our holy race, and raising him to a yet more glorious position as the father of a spiritual Israel, the founder of a nobler and more prolific line."

St. Paul, then, sets Abraham before us as the example of Justification by Faith. It follows that, if we wish to know what he means by Justification by Faith, we ought to inquire what is the characteristic in Abraham which St. Paul lays hold of as an illustration.

This seems, on the whole, the best explanation of the ambiguous words $\kappa a \tau \dot{a}$ $\sigma \approx \kappa a \pi a$.

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Let us turn to the fifteenth Chapter of Genesis, to which St. Paul refers us. The patriarch had returned from his victory over the the kings, and the loneliness of his household, with none but his slaves to inherit his property, may well have made him feel bitterly that God had given him everything except the blessing he most longed for. And then it was that the word of Jehovah came to him in a vision, saving. "Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." I Hereupon Abram is encouraged to speak out what is in his mind, and he says, "What wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless: and lo, one born in my house, a servant, is my heir?" Then God promised him an heir born of his own stock, and shewed him that magnificent sight, the depth of the Eastern sky, with stars whose number and brightness we in the dull West can hardly concoine; and said unto him, "So shall thy seed be." The host of heaven, which so many Eastern tribes have been led to worship for their glory and brightness as the divinest thing they knew, was to Abraham only the sacramental pledge, the outward and visible sign, of the covenant of Jehovah with his servant. "And he believed in Jehovah; and He counted it to him for righteousness." In the stillness of the night, beneath the star-spangled heaven, Abraham received into his soul the Divine promise, and believed, "as seeing Him who is invisible." That multitude of stars witnessed to him of the Lord of heaven and earth, "dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see." The order and

^{*} Kalisch translates this, "Thy reward will be very great."

regularity of their movements, or apparent movements, witnessed to him of the Lord of whose will all order and law is the expression; and he believed God.

This, then, seems to be the essence of Abraham's faith—the power to rise above the visible and the tangible, and to enter into a personal relation with the invisible God. God's first call to him came in the form of a command, however conveyed, to leave his country and his father's house, and to go into a land of which as yet he knew nothing. Abraham obeyed, and by his obedience he loosened the ties which bound him to the visible world. Again, God led him into solitude, into the dark and silent night, and renewed his covenant with him; and again Abraham took God at his word, and trusted Him absolutely. This belief in the invisible, then, is surely the habit of mind which God especially approves. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," were our Lord's words to Thomas. "We walk by faith, not by sight," says St. Paul. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." "Without faith," says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "it is impossible to please God;" and faith he has just defined to be "the evidence of things not seen."

We need not be at a loss to understand why Faith holds so high a position in the hierarchy of Christian graces. For when Christ came preaching the kingdom of heaven, He meant by this, not a kingdom that should take shape in some far-distant time and place, but a kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy now.

When He spoke of eternal life, He spoke not merely of a life that shall have no end-though this, by the very nature of things, it must be-but mainly of a life that is above this present world, a life that is "hid in God." And therefore the faculty which enables a man to rise from this present lower state from which Christ has delivered us 2 into the higher life, must be the one indispensable faculty, without which there can be no salvation. As long as a man lives in the world of sense, in the world which he can see and hear and touch, he is not vet delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. He may be, in the ordinary sense, a good man; he may abstain from all that his conscience tells him is wrong: he may be liberal, kind, thoughtful, just, temperate; but if the spiritual world is not yet real to him, nay, if it is not more real than the material world, he is still in the state of what St. Paul calls ψυχικός—the natural man-and is "of the world." And this may help us to understand why St. Paul so emphatically declares that "a man is justified by faith (χωρίς έργων rόμου) apart from the deeds of the law;" 3 because, whereas man can only look at results, God looks at the hidden springs of action, and sees whether a man's good works spring from a lively faith, that is, from a living and true relation between himself and God, or from a mere sense of moral fitness, or from the gross, mercantile notion that he expects to be paid for them

The question how far the adjective ἀιώνιος involves the idea of time is a more difficult one than might appear to those who have not studied it. Let it be noticed here simply that ἀιών means an age or stage of existence, and that ζωή ἀιώνιος means the life not of this lower, but of the higher and heavenly ἀιών.

² Cf. Gal. i. 4: ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἀιῶνος πονηροῦ—that he might deliver us from this present evil age or state of existence.

³ Rom. iii. 28.

hereafter. Viewed in this light, the doctrine of Justification by Faith becomes simply an assertion of the spiritual nature of God's kingdom, a protest against those low and carnal views of religion which Christianity was designed to supersede.

True, it may be said, Abraham's justification by faith may mean something very simple, because he lived in pre-Messianic days, and therefore his faith may well have been simply a trust in God and a right relation to Him. But we live in Gospel times, under the New Dispensation; to us Christ is known as our Saviour. Is not our faith, then, to be directed to Him as its object? Assuredly it is. And yet, if St. Paul takes Abraham as his instance of faith, it can hardly be that he would have us regard his faith as of an inferior kind to ours, or as standing on a lower level. And a little consideration may help us to see that Abraham's faith was really one with ours. For what is faith in Christ? It is accepting Him as the perfect manifestation of the Father's mind and will, according to his own words, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." And, therefore, although God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ has brought us nearer to Him, and made it more easy for us to know and trust Him, yet Abraham's faith had the same object as ours; and therefore if he, seeing God, as it were, afar off, trusted Him and obeyed his command, surely his faith was not inferior, but rather superior, to ours, in that we have received the promise which he had only seen and greeted from a distance.

Abraham's faith, then, consisted in an unswerving trust in the unseen God. It is this element in it that is brought out in the eleventh Chapter of the Epistle

to the Hebrews: "These all" (it is with immediate reference to Abraham and Sarah that the words occur), "these all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and greeted them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." It is this detachment of the soul from the visible and tangible, this power of looking not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen, this capacity of living a life hid with Christ in God, that constitutes the essence of faith. And here we see the root-distinction between Justification by Works and Justification by Faith. What is it to seek to be justilled by works? It is to look not at the things which are not seen, but at the things which are seen; to worry ourselves about details; to be anxious about matters of observance, of casuistry, of religious etiquette; to think that God cares for the outward act and not for the inward motive. Hence justification by works involves taking an unworthy and low idea of God; it implies that we regard Him as one like ourselves, who can judge of the inward only from the outward, and who must get at a man's character from a careful observation and comparison of his acts. Whereas if God is not only, in the sublime words of the Psalmist, "about our path and about our bed," but also, in the yet more spiritual conception of the New Testament, "a Discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," it is certain that his judgment is formed not by our acts, but by those inner springs of thought and will which precede action, and of which we ourselves are often hardly conscious. And therefore the cleansing of the outside of the cup and platter,

which might well pass muster with a human judge, is useless with Him; to meet his judgment we must make clean that which is within, that the outside may be clean also. This is why the Pharisees, the great example in Scripture of justification by works, are so often called by the Lord hypocrites; for a man who looks at the outside, who regards acts and not motives, is exactly described as ὑποκρίτης—" an actor," one who sustains a part, one whose words and acts are put on, and do not spring from his heart. Whereas to be justified by faith is to have the heart right with God, to have the affections set on things above, to have the life hid with Christ in God. This is why faith can move mountains; because it looks straight to the end, and overlooks all obstacles. This is why, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God;" because, accepting with our whole hearts God's revelation of his fatherly love in Christ, we are no longer anxious and terrified about our acceptance with Him; for we know that He accepts us, not for anything in ourselves. but because of his free grace and goodness manifested in his Son Jesus Christ. This is why to seek to be justified by works must necessarily stunt and hinder the spiritual growth; because it induces a habit of stooping, of looking downwards, of grovelling in the earth instead of aspiring to heaven. And in this way the doctrine of justification by faith at once places all questions of outward observance, of ritual, of sacred days and sacred places, in their proper places; because it teaches that God desires not sacrifice, that He is not worshipped with men's hands, nor with their voices, nor with their garments; that the sacrifice of God is a humble spirit; that what He seeks is the worship of the heart and of the life; and that He cares nothing for the worship of the lips or of the ritual, save in so far as it is expressive of, or conducive to, the other. This, too, may enable us to understand St. Paul's very strong language respecting the law. "Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." To seek for righteousness in works, in the deeds of the law, was, in St. Paul's conception, to be separated from Christ. "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."

It remains to ask the further question, What did St. Paul mean by the term Justification or Righteousness? And here we need to be on our guard against the very common mistake of interpreting a writer by a sort of ev post facto process, by the use of words in later writings and systems. In every subject-matter, and in theology more than in any other, words tend to become more and more technical; new associations and new meanings gather round them; controversies leave upon them their indelible mark; often they become watchwords of parties, so that the very use of them inevitably recalls to our minds thoughts of heat and strife, quite foreign to the simple and unartificial sense in which they were first used. To take an example from the political vocabulary, the word "Liberal" originally meant inclining to or making for freedom. Now it is used chiefly to denote a particular set of political views, in which the original sense is not indeed entirely merged, but greatly overshadowed by number-

less details not necessarily connected with it. And in like manner in theology it was pointed out in 1 a former number of this Magazine that such words as the Letter and the Spirit, the Law and the Gospel, and the like, have gradually accumulated secondary and technical connotations by which the original and simpler sense has been almost obscured. So also Justification (δικάιωμα or δικάιωσις—the word occurs only three times in the English Version, in Romans iv. 25 and v. 16, 18, in the first and last of which it represents δικαίωσις, and in the second δικαίωμα), meaning simply 2 the making just or righteous, is by Cruden defined as "a gracious act of God, whereby He pardons and accepts of sinners on the account of Christ's righteousness imputed to them, and received by faith." It may be so; but this meaning is certainly not involved in the original word, nor could it be so understood by those who first read the Epistle. Nor would St. Paul's illustration—the justification of Abraham—naturally suggest this sense. There is no allusion in Genesis to Abraham's being pardoned and accepted on account of a righteousness imputed to him and received by faith. We are simply told that he believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness; in other words, God was well pleased with his faith. It is true that faith receives a fuller and deeper significance in the Christian Dispensation; and, in the same way, righteousness, or justification, is a more complete, a more developed conception when viewed in relation to Christ's resurrection. "Faith." St. Paul says, "was reckoned to Abraham for righteous-

¹ See The Expositor, vol. ix. p. 162.

² There is no authority for understanding $\delta wa:\delta \omega$ in the sense of acquitting or considering just by a legal fiction one who is guilty. It means usually to make just, or to claim as just.

ness. But it was not written for his sake alone that it was reckoned to him, but for us also, to whom it (righteousness) shall be reckoned, if we, like Abraham, have faith; if we believe on God as he did, yet not on the same grounds as he did, but on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Abraham was justified by his faith in God, who revealed Himself to him in night visions, by dark and mysterious figures, in the guiding of his unseen hand, by promises of a far-off future; we are justified by our faith in God, who has revealed Himself to us in his Son, and who has raised that Son Jesus Christ from the dead to establish our faith and to complete our justification.

Most of us accept so slavishly the theological traditions in which we have been brought up, that many may be surprised to learn that the doctrine of "Imputed Righteousness" was not heard of for fifteen centuries after Christ. Yet it is undoubtedly true that "the notion of imputation, in the sense of a transfer, by a kind of juridical fiction, of our sins to Christ, and his righteousness to his members, was first started in the sixteenth century." The notion of imputation, in the sense of ascribing to a person that which does not properly belong to him, probably arose from the fact that the Vulgate renders έλογίσθη by reputatum est; and the forensic theory of the Atonement doubtless found favour at the time of the Reformation by reason of the monstrous perversion by which practically salvation and remission of sins could be purchased for money, and a man's favour with God depended on his libe-

¹ See Oxenham, Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement, p. 87.

rality to the Church. At such a time, the doctrine that works are not the cause of salvation, that a man is justified by faith only, was "a most wholesome doctrine," was, indeed, essential to the life of the Church; and Luther's preaching could not have produced the effect that it did if he had not seized upon a root-truth. But the development of this doctrine, the carrying out into logical sequence mere imperfect and partial illustrations, produced a mass of theological minutiæ, an intricate tangle of dogmas, not unlike those which the schoolmen had busied themselves in spinning, evolving them endlessly, like silkworms, in the three centuries before the Reformation. It may be that it is the duty of this age, in view of the attacks which the Christian Faith has to sustain on this side and on that, and of the rapidly increasing indifference to dogmatic theology which is so marked a sign of the times, to seek to go back to the simpler and more rudimentary forms of belief which sufficed for the spiritual life of the earliest Christians, and which, after all, are the nourishment of all simple souls. Many a devout believer would be quite unable to formulate any consistent or reasonable theory of the Atonement, to whom, nevertheless.

> Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee;

or, again—

Nothing in my hand I bring, Simply to Thy Cross I cling,

are the very expression of the deepest and truest feelings of his heart. We do not, for the most part, form consistent theories of our relation to those who are dearest to us; if our children love us and trust us, we are more than contented that they should not analyze and account for their feeling towards us; and when we

believe that "when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," and that He "bare our sins in his own body to the tree." we may, if we will, "being justified by faith, have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," while leaving others to formulate theories which at the best can but express a partial aspect of the truth, and which too often have been forged as weapons of theological warfare.

In one other respect the history of "the father of the faithful" may be very helpful to us in the present day. "By faith," we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "he went out, not knowing whither he went; . . . for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Many and many an earnest Christian nowadays, to whom belief in God and the knowledge of God is the one urgent need of his soul, has had to "get him out of his country and from his kindred, and from his father's house," to leave the special theological system in which he was brought up, to break with many of the dearest associations of his youth, perhaps, alas! to part from friends who were as a second self to him, and to "go forth, not knowing whither he went." Happy he who in such a hour, though "dwelling in tabernacles," obliged to content himself with a provisional system of theology, and to "take no thought for the morrow," has yet been able to look for a city which hath foundations, and to hear the Divine promise, "Fear not; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward." Of such an one surely it shall be recorded at last, that he "believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." R. E. BARTLETT.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON ROMANS IX. 5.

As the Editor kindly permits me to return to this subject, I will begin with an admission somewhat to my own disadvantage. On second thoughts, I agree very much with Dr. Sanday in thinking that my previous paper attributed too much weight to the stop, as found in the three or four Manuscripts,—ancient and important as these unquestionably are. I may add, however, that I could not have really intended to claim the stop as in itself sufficient "to settle the question of punctuation;" for, indeed, I spoke of it expressly as only a contributing witness, and as of decisive weight when "taken along with other evidence." So that I shall probably be acquitted of any very unpardonable exaggeration in the terms I employed.

Nevertheless, the presence of the stop in the Manuscripts referred to is an interesting circumstance, and one which should not have been left so much out of sight in the critical editions. I venture to add that Dr. Sanday appears to me to underestimate its value. Does it not, at all events, serve to refute the assertion sometimes made, that this punctuation is new, that it is nothing but a modern innovation? Such is the substance of Dr. Liddon's objection, to which, perhaps too hastily, I assumed that Canon Farrar assented. It is, of course, very largely a matter of opinion how much or how little the stop is in itself worth. But what cannot, I suppose, be disputed is this, that there were copyists so early as the fifth century, perhaps the fourth, men whose native tongue most probably was Greek, who saw no impropriety or incorrectness in dividing the sentence at σάρκα, and commencing a new sentence with the words, δ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. All, accordingly, that I now wish to contend for is that the Verse may be properly, i.e., grammatically, so divided and so interpreted. I think, too, that I may now call attention to the fact, as one of interest in connection with the Verse, that neither Canon Farrar nor Dr. Sanday has denied, or said anything that involves a denial of this position. On the contrary, and a little to my surprise, they both seem prepared to accept it, even though somewhat doubtfully and with hesitation. neither of them speak with confidence of the Authorized punctuation. The one observes: "Lastly, I had come to the very same conclusion as that which Dr. Smith approves in Dr. Sanday, only that I had said that I personally believed the reference of the clause to be

¹ Woide has marked it in his edition of the Alexandrine, and Lachmann and Tischendorf have the stop in their respective *texts*.

to Christ, while Dr. Sanday says that the 'application to our Lord appears perhaps a little the more probable of the two." And the other repeats his previous acknowledgment of the doubtfulness of the Verse, writing in The Enpositor, "Nor, in fact, can I be convinced by the arguments on either side that the passage is one on which it is possible to have a very strong and decided opinion. There is much to be said on both sides, but nothing quite conclusive."

But further, let me ask, in the presence of this hesitation on the part of both my critics, what is the value of that unanimity of the Fathers to which Canon Farrar so triumphantly points? Is their testimony to be so unceremoniously put aside, as only warranting a slight probability after all? I cannot but think that those who so readily follow the Fathers in their doctrine of the incarnate Logos might have shewn a little more reliance upon them in regard to the construction of this Verse.

I notice that Dr. Sanday speaks almost as if he doubted the correctness of my report as to the presence of the point in the Alexandrine manuscript, while Canon Farrar quotes my words, "evidently a prima manu," used in reference to the same Manuscript, very much as if he too intended to suggest the same doubt. May I beg the two doubters (if they are such) to take the first opportunity of going to the British Museum to look at the Manuscript for themselves? They will easily gain access to it; and, if their eyesight be tolerably good, I venture to say they will be perfectly satisfied (from the colour of the ink and from the existence of the space) that the stop is a real stop, and from the first hand. The same will be found in the Ephraim Manuscript (C), so far, at least, as the space is concerned; although it may be uncertain whether the little cross which serves for a stop is as old as the writing. But the important thing is the space and about this there can be no doubt whatever.

In regard to the Vatican (B), I readily admit, the age of the stop may be fairly considered doubtful. Cardinal Pitra, by whom on one occasion the Manuscript was shewn to me, and to whom I pointed it out, observed at once that it might be of later date than the writing. On the other hand, Tischendorf holds that many of the stops in B are a prima manu; and I do not know of any good reason why this particular point should not be one of them.

I agree, then, with my critics that the presence of this stop in the Manuscripts does not actually determine the construction of the Verse. For this, as I observed before, we must look to the analogy of St. Paul's Epistles in his use of the word $\theta \epsilon \delta g$; and that analogy

ought, I submit, to have the greatest weight in deciding the question. St. Paul, then, as I pointed out, although he uses the word $\theta \epsilon \delta c$ more than five hundred times, has never applied it to Christ, unless it be in this doubtful case, and in another which is equally disputable (Tit. ii. 13). It is not, then, I venture to say, the most natural to think that he has so applied the word here. Nor can I withhold the expression of my surprise that any one should be satisfied to rest in the conclusion that Christ was represented by the Apostle as "God over all," on the small amount of probability which it appears, on the shewing of Canon Farrar and Dr. Sanday themselves, is all that can be claimed for that proposition, so far as this Verse is concerned.

In reply to this serious objection, however, Canon Farrar, referring to several passages in St. Paul's Epistles, asks the question, Whether any one, with these before him, "can have one moment's doubt that St Paul would speak of Christ as God?" I must not here discuss the passages referred to; but I may say that I have looked carefully at them all, and that I entirely fail to find in them any indication that the Apostle (who does not appear to have held the Logos doctrine) could or would have applied the term in question in the way supposed. At any rate, the fact remains in all its weight that he has never done so in any passage which does not fairly and

grammatically admit of a different interpretation.

My last-named criticizer has entered into various details in defence of the Authorized punctuation. Into these I must not attempt to follow him in this place. One only I may perhaps be allowed to notice. He asks the question, "Why this abrupt doxology at the very threshold of the argument, bursting into praise in the midst of a most sad argument, changing an elegy into a hymn?" The question is one which scarcely needs an answer, beyond the remark that such a sentence is in accordance with the Apostle's style. But I may note there is a similar ascription of praise in the midst of an argument equally sad, or, indeed, more so, in Romans i. 25. The words are surely very appropriate in their connection, following as they do an enumeration of the privileges of Israel, culminating in the gift of the Christ. The paragraph seems quite naturally to draw to a climax. almost as if it had said, These and these are the great honours and advantages of my brethren, God be praised for them. "He who is God over all is [or be] blessed for ever. Amen."

G. VANCE SMITH.

It will hardly be necessary for me to reply at any great length to Dr. Vance Smith; the less so as his "Additional Note" either tends to reduce the points of difference between us to dimensions that do not seem worth arguing, or else raises questions much too large to be discussed within the narrow boundaries of a "Note."

I addressed myself originally to that part of Dr. Vance Smith's argument which was most novel, and which he himself seemed to think altered the balance of the argument, as it had hitherto stood, in his favour. I endeavoured to shew, chiefly upon Dr. Vance Smith's own premisses, that this was far too much weight to attach to it. Dr. Vance Smith now practically admits all for which I should care to contend.

Since I last wrote I have had an opportunity of examining the Codex Alexandrinus, and I quite agree with Dr. Vance Smith that there can be no doubt as to the punctuation. It is altogether plainer than I had expected to find it. The point is clearly marked, and it is evidently by the first hand. Future critical editors should take note of this, and the fact should be credited, so far as it goes, to Dr. Vance Smith's side of the argument. There seems now to be less danger of its importance being exaggerated.

The rest that Dr. Vance Smith says, I confess, touches me very little. When he writes that the point on which he is now prepared to insist "is that there were copyists so early as the fifth century, perhaps the fourth, men whose native tongue most probably was Greek, who saw no incorrectness in dividing the sentence at $\sigma \acute{a}\rho \kappa a_{\mu}$, and commencing a new sentence with the words \acute{b} \acute{w} \acute{e} \acute{m} \acute{e} \acute{e}

In weighing this further question, I do not at all "put aside unceremoniously" the evidence of the Fathers. On the contrary, I attach considerable importance to it. But I desire to do justice to such considerations as those which are urged by Mr. Beet on the other side. It is, of course, very possible for an argument to be strong without being in itself conclusive, and without being exempt from qualification by other arguments. And those who are accustomed to estimate most nicely the force of arguments will be the last to attempt to pin down an antagonist to the sort of "all or nothing" which is so common in partisan controversy.

I read with surprise Dr. Vance Smith's expression of surprise

"that any one should be satisfied to rest in the conclusion that Christ was represented by the Apostle 'as God over all' on the small amount of probability which, it appears, is all that can be claimed for that proposition, so far as this Verse is concerned." If I had wished to affirm any such proposition (and I am not aware that I did affirm it), I certainly should not have rested it on this Verse alone. But the surprise which Dr. Vance Smith, I think rather unnecessarily, expresses here, I cannot help reciprocating at a statement of his own—the statement, I mean, that St. Paul "does not appear to have held the Logos doctrine." I should have thought it quite incredible that a fair-minded critic could say this, except, of course, in the purely verbal sense that St. Paul does not actually use the technical term Logos. Not to speak of other passages, Colossians i. 15–19 seems unmistakeable.

W. SANDAY.

It always seems to me a most unprofitable waste of time to continue a controversy after both sides have clearly said what they have to say. I cannot see that Dr. Vance Smith, in the above remarks, has added one iota of fresh evidence to the solution of the question; nor can I see how they help his position at all, except by shifting the real grounds of the controversy, and by giving him the benefit of the "last word," which I should always be happy to concede to any controversialist who attached much importance to it. I had not the slightest intention, therefore, to add anything to what I had previously said, and it is only at the request of the Editor that for one moment I revert to the subject.

r. I find this reply of Dr. Vance Smith singularly intangible. Its shape—

If shape it might be called, that shape had none Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb, Or substance might be called that shadow seemed—

is too vague to admit of any firm grasp. The sole point of any importance in his first criticism on my paper was his evidence as to the punctuation in one or two of the Uncials. This has been quite sufficiently examined and appraised in the June number of The Expositor, and in his first paragraph Dr. Vance Smith admits that he "attributed too much weight to the stop."

2. In his second paragraph he maintains that the existence of the stop in these Manuscripts proves that the doxologic interpretation of the clause is grammatically admisssible; but there is nothing to say on this point, because, "a little to his surprise" (why to his surprise?),

both Dr. Sanday and I had already stated our opinion that such is the case. Other scholars hold very strongly that the position of linkognation late in the clause proves that it cannot be a doxology, and among them is Dean Alford, one of the most competent scholars in Hellenistic Greek who ever lived. The authority of one or two fiftheentury scribes on the grammatical question has exceedingly little weight, and although I cannot go quite so far as Dean Alford does when he says that the rendering of our English Version is "the only one admissible by the rules of grammar and arrangement," yet if the interpretation of Erasmus, followed by Dr. Vance Smith, be barely tenable, it is confessedly an isolated instance, and Dr. Smith has barely so much as touched the arguments of usage, order, sense, and position, which tell so powerfully against it.

3. In his third paragraph, Dr. V. Smith asks what is the value of the unanimity of the Fathers in favour of the attributive meaning of the clause as adopted in the English Version, if that unanimity can only be regarded as adding a slight probability to the view which they accept. I pass over the fact that he felt inclined at first to dispute this all but absolute unanimity, and I will only say that, while no one dreams of accepting the unanimity of the Fathers as decisive on a critical question (and it must be remembered that it was on a purely critical question that this discussion arose), it must be, at any rate, vastly more weighty than the by no means indisputable evidence of three or four nameless copyists. The rest of this third paragraph is a purely irrelevant argumentum ad hominem, and transfers the question from critical to theological grounds. The doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord is not one which can be discussed as an open question in the pages of The Expositor; but Dr. V. Smith must be well aware that when he talks of our "so readily following the Fathers in our doctrine of the Incarnate Logos," he is using language the accuracy of which we should entirely repudiate. Our doctrine of the Incarnate Logos is derived, not from the Fathers, but from St. John, and the Apostles, and our Lord Himself.

4. In his fourth and fitth paragraphs, Dr. V. Smith returns to his excessively attenuated tittle of evidence about the Uncials, which, as we have already seen, mainly resolves itself into the existence of a stop, asserted to be original, in the Alexandrine Manuscript. On this point more than enough has been said already.

5. In his sixth paragraph, admitting the indecisiveness of his diplomatic evidence, Dr. V. Smith restates what he had stated already, and what the Emperor Julian asserted fifteen centuries

before him, that St. Paul nowhere calls Christ God. On this point I have said enough. It is quite true that (although even Socinus was compelled to admit that the clause which we are discussing refers to Christ) this and the other passage in which Christ is distinctly called God (as Tit. ii. 13; Acts xxi. 28) are grammatically or critically disputable, nor would any one readily quote them in the controversy with Unitarians, because

Nil agit exemplum quod litem lite resolvit.

But, while declining here to discuss that question, I simply refer to the passages which I quoted in my last paper, and once more answer Dr. V. Smith that our faith in the Divinity of the Eternal Son by no means rests on two or three isolated texts, but on the witness of History to the truth of all that is written of Christ Jesus, from the beginning to the end of the New Testament. Dr. Smith says that St. Paul "does not appear to have held the Logos doctrine." It would be truer to say that, for sufficient reasons, St. Paul does not use the word Logos. How any one can read the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians (to say nothing of the Pastoral Epistles) without seeing that St. Paul believed in the essential Divinity of Christ is more than I can pretend to understand.

6. In his last paragraph Dr. Smith tries to shake my subordinate argument about the abruptness of a doxology in Romans ix. 5 by the exceedingly weak analogy of Romans i. 25. This latter Verse is not a doxology at all, and any one who will thoughtfully compare the two passages will see how totally they differ. I refrain from any reiteration of those strong arguments in favour of our Authorized rendering, which Dr. Smith has not so much as touched; and if any one will again read what has been said on both sides, I shall be surprised if he considers that Dr. Smith, with all his learning, has rendered any appreciable assistance to the view which he maintains.

F. W. FARRAR.

BRIEF NOTICE.

THE REALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS OF MODERN SCIENCE EXAMINED. By Thomas Herbert, M.A., late Professor of Philosophy and Church History in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester. (Macmillan and Co. 1879.) This is an admirable piece of philosophical criticism—calm, subtle, incisive, thorough. It appears, indeed, with all the disadvantages of a posthumous work, without the revision, condensation, amplification the author alone could have

given. To a book like this the want of the author's eye and hand is an almost absolute loss, even when, as here, the editor has been almost too scrupulously faithful to the *litera scripta* of his author. Yet, as it stands, the book is a legacy to be received with gratitude and regret—gratitude that so much has been given, regret that the hand that gave it can give no more. Indeed, the reader seems ever to sit in the shadow cast by Mr. Herbert's untimely death, the book has lost so much by it, and the cause the book represents. We never knew him, but to know his book is to know that he must have been a man of fine simplicity of spirit, transparent, single-minded, a vigorous and independent thinker, strenuous in his love of truth and in his search after it. To feel that death has deprived us of such a man is to feel how much we have lost.

The strength of the book lies in its criticism; in construction it is much less successful. The author had carefully and exhaustively elaborated his philosophy in its polemical aspects; but as regards its constructive parts, he had manifestly laboured less at either the foundation or superstructure. In his positive sections he says, indeed, much that is true, reasons subtly, speculates ingeniously and boldly; but he does not lay with sufficient breadth his philosophical principles, or handle with sufficient knowledge his philosophical terms and ideas. We do not feel free in the sad circumstances in which the book has appeared to be critical of its terminology and structure, especially as these leave its substantial merits unimpaired. Taken simply as a criticism of what it terms "the Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science," it is altogether worthy of praise. It is directed against the new metaphysic that has appeared disguised as physicism. Professor Herbert saw with admirable clearness that certain recent scientific speculations were really metaphysical, though proceeding with the most happy unconsciousness of their own nature; and he directed his criticism to show that the metaphysics and physics are in radical antagonism, that the metaphysical doctrines either disprove or invalidate the physical conclusions. And in this work he is most entirely successful. His very limitations become here excellences. He confines himself to "modern science;" touches philosophy, strictly so called, only where it touches and supports scientific speculation. Hence there is a point in his criticism that comes of their strict relevancy to to-day. He often reasons against our scientific Materialism as we can imagine Bishop Berkelev might have done. It is metaphysically an empirical Idealism, but constructively, a "cosmothetic Realism." On the psychological or

subjective side it reasons as if empirical Idealism were true, and explains mental processes and phenomena by its principles; on the ontological or objective side it reasons as if Realism were true, and advances its explanation of the universe in harmony with this assumption, yet is meekly unconscious of making it. But the two positions exclude and annihilate each other. If empirical Idealism is true, objective science, or a science of objective things, is, in any real sense, impossible; man can never transcend appearances, or attain the knowledge of truth, as, indeed, there can be no truth for him to know. Hume was the most consistent of modern empiricists, and in his Scepticism Empiricism found its happiest and most logical result. Indeed, it has never got beyond him, or has done so only by doing violence to his first principles. The significance of Hume for our living speculation is just beginning to be understood. and the interesting monograph on him by our most distinguished English physico-philosopher is a happy sign of recognition and

appreciation.

It is not necessary to follow in detail the argument by which Mr. Herbert seeks to make good his thesis. To do so would lead us, both in the way of exposition and criticism, far beyond our limits. may be enough to say, that any criticism we would be inclined to make would leave the substantial value of his argument, so far as critical, untouched. He does most conclusively prove that science cannot explain the connection between brain changes and thought. or combine movements and thoughts in one scheme. Materialism suffers from two radical inabilities—the inability to discover any real or causal relation between the physical organism and mental processes, and the inability so to know what is as to construct a science of it. By virtue of the one inability it cannot explain the fact and phenomena of mind; by virtue of the other it can never reach a science of the universe, must end all its struggles after knowledge by a confession of blank ignorance, by the paralysis of reason, and the negation of morality. This radical incompetence of Materialism is a truth this age needs to be made to recognize, the more that it is so disinclined to recognize it. Physical science has infinite promise in its own sphere, but beyond it its promises are all illusive, can only bewilder and deceive. He who can make this apparent to our age will help it in its search after truth as in its rational and religious faith. And this is the work Mr. Herbert aimed at doing, and what he aimed at doing he has in a greater degree than is granted to many actually done. A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

GOD WRESTLING WITH MAN, AND MAN WITH GOD.

(GENESIS XXXII. 24-28.)

How shall we name the strange story recorded in these Verses? what title shall we give it? Shall we call it "Jacob wrestling with Jehovah," or "Jehovah wrestling with Jacob"?

That is not a mere question of words and names, but a question which penetrates to the very heart of the story, and determines which of two wholly different lessons we are to learn from it.

The popular and accepted answer to the question is that, in this story, we see Jacob wrestling with Jehovah, in some mysterious way overcoming Him, and wringing from Him a blessing which He was reluctant to grant, which He granted only to force and importunity. And it must be confessed that there is much in the sacred narrative to account for this popular conception, and which seems to confirm it. The latter part of the narrative, indeed, seems hardly consistent with any other hypothesis. When we read that at daybreak Jacob's Divine Antagonist said to him, "Let me go," and that Jacob replied, "I will not let thee go, except thou bless me;" when we read the words with which God closes the conflict, "Thou shalt be called no more Jacob, but Israel, for as prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed," we cannot

wonder that, at least in the popular apprehension, the story figures as that of a weak and mortal man contending with the Lord of all power and might, and compelling even the pure almighty will of God to yield to his importunity. We cannot wonder that the metaphor, so common in our hymns and prayers, of "wrestling with God in supplication" has been drawn from it. We can hardly wonder that scholars and theologians have adopted the popular conception, if they did not originate it.

And yet the very moment we "consider" it, the very moment that, instead of adopting and repeating it, we begin to ponder and weigh it, to take it out of the dusky atmosphere of traditional interpretation and ecclesiastical usage, and to look at it in the broad light of day, it grows dubious to us. God is not reluctant to give us any blessing that we seek and can use; we have not to wrestle with Him for them. The purport of prayer is not to deafen Him with vain and clamorous repetitions, or to weary Him with ceaseless importunities, till He gives us what we ask, in order that He may get rid of us. When we pray, we do not so "knock" at the door of Heaven as to disturb its peace, and compel God either to drive us from his door or to silence us with a bribe. He is more willing to give than we are to ask; and we do not seek to impose our will on Him, but to submit our wills to his in trust and love.

Not that prayer is useless and obtains no gifts for us. It has many uses, and brings us many gifts. When we enter into the Divine Presence with a humble and an open heart, we enter into a pure and sacred Light, in which we learn to know ourselves, to

read and interpret our various and innumerable desires, to distinguish their several qualities and comparative moment, to select and urge those which are highest and best; our life grows simpler to us and truer, our duties more plain and imperative, our burdens more endurable.

In prayer, moreover, we make a sincere and continuous endeavour to lift our wills into harmony with the will of God, to blend it with his, and say, "Thy will, not ours, be done;" and by thus drawing, or permitting Him to draw, our wills into a fuller and more cheerful consent with his will, we fit ourselves to receive, and to use for good and worthy ends, many great gifts which could not otherwise be safely entrusted to us. When we can do without any outward good, if that should be God's will, we can often do with it; it will not harm us now that we are of one will with Him, although it might have harmed us before. So that by submitting our wills to God, by lifting ourselves into a sincere assent to his will, we often reach a point at which He can let us have our own will, since our wills are now purified and strengthened by prayer. In short, God's will always stands at the giving-point; all that remains to be determined is how much we are fit and able to take - just as the sun shines on all things with an impartial bounty, and yet every substance and texture on which it shines only appropriates just as much as it can absorb and use.

We have not to deal with a reluctant God, therefore, nor with an unjust Judge, who can be worn out by our importunities, nor with a fond and too amiable Friend, who may be moved to bestow what yet he knows it will do us harm to get. We can neither storm nor coax a gift from the Father of lights. We have not

to wrestle with and overcome Him whose will is always our welfare. And if his will already and always points to our welfare, can we even wish, save for a base and passing moment, to deflect his will from the point at which it stands? If his will be pure and almighty, can we hope to compel Him to change and lower it? The laws of mechanics do not hold in the spiritual realm; and if we ever "move the Hand that moves the universe," we move it by no mere mechanical pressure, but by the impact of spirit on spirit. For myself, indeed, I shrink from the conception of prayer implied in the boast, "We move the Hand that moves the universe," though I do not at all doubt that we get by prayer what those who use that phrase mainly mean by it. For all things may become different to us, all things may become new even, without any external change passing over them—simply by some new and different adjustment or relation of our spirits to them. Earth may be made heaven, and loss gain, and sorrow joy, not by any change in our physical conditions, but by a change in ourselves, i.e., in our mode of regarding them. And thus God may answer our widest prayer, may really move and change the universe for us, not by interfering with the physical forces and motions and laws which constitute the universe, but by so touching the springs of thought and emotion within us that, to our new and altered selves, the whole world not only seems, but is, a new and altered world. It is in this region of inward and spiritual experience that we must look for the answers to most of our prayers; it is in this region that we get power with God and prevail. So that God is better to us than we think Him to be. Instead of giving an answer in the outward and perishable elements of the world, which we must soon lose, He gives us answers that we may keep for ever, because, being spiritual, they are also eternal.

As soon, then, as we think and consider, we discover that we cannot force the hand of God, that we have no need to force it, since He is not reluctant to give us anything which it will be good for us to have. We discover also that prayer does both fit us to receive many gifts which could not else be safely entrusted to us, and confers on us a power with God which is all the more valuable and enduring because it is a spiritual power. Now can we find anything in this incident in Jacob's life which confirms or illustrates these thoughts? Assuredly we can the very moment we observe that the passage before us describes two conflicts, in one of which God wrestles with Jacob, and in the other of which Jacob wrestles with God.

(1) In Verses 21 and 22 God wrestles with Jacob. We are not told that Jacob went to God, but that God came to him, and wrestled with him until daybreak; and that, when He found He could not otherwise prevail with him, He touched a sinew, which shrank at his touch, and thus overcame him. What are we to understand by such a story as this? What is the historical and spiritual meaning of it? If we grant, as I am very willing to do, that there was a real human or angelic form which came into physical contact with the form of Jacob, which strove and panted with him, and by some dexterous wrench or throw strained and cracked the sinew of his thigh, yet no man supposes that this physical struggle is the very heart of the matter. No, we must look through this outward show for that which

passeth show. And if we do look through it, we can easily see that in this scene the meaning, the intention, of God's whole dealing with Jacob is summed up; that at this critical moment the weak, smooth, subtle man—whose very subtlety, perhaps, was only the wrong side of that spiritual susceptibility which made the invisible world near and precious to him—passed through some such inward experience as this.

Filled with restless anxieties and fears at the prospect of meeting a brother whom he had cruelly wronged and defrauded, Jacob remained in solitude on the northern side of the brook Jabbok, to ponder, in the silence and darkness of the night, what he should do, what he could still do, if indeed ought were still possible, to avert the anger of Esau. All his life long, despite the more upward and spiritual aspect of his nature, Jacob had relied on his own cunning to deliver him out of the difficulties and dangers which that very cunning did so much to induce. And, now, he bids his brains go about and see if they cannot devise some further scheme for turning away his brother's wrath. He reflects, perhaps, with some complacency on the device he has already set in motion, on the series of propitiatory presents which he has despatched to "my lord Esau," and indulges the hope that they may go far to appease his anger. But will they go far enough? Can he hit on nothing else and surer? Probably he thinks with deepening remorse of the sins of his youth, and wishes that he had not committed them. Possibly a vein of anger tinges his very remorse, and he deems it hard that after so many years, years of toil and suffering, the sins of his youth should still overtake and compass him about, But, great and perilous as the

difficulty is, there must surely be some way out of it, if only he can shake off the fears which confuse and blind him, and survey the position with cool and wary eyes. And so he paces to and fro on the rough edge of the torrent, vexed by many thoughts and schemes and cares and fears, but still trusting in himself, in his own subtlety and dexterity, for some way of deliverance. At last, towards morning, his care and fear take, or seem to take, bodily shape; and he is grasped by a force he cannot see, and has to wrestle with it in the darkness. What does that mean if not that a conviction, an unwelcome conviction, a conviction against which he struggles, rises and grows within him-the conviction that he is on a wrong tack, and has been on it all his life; that he is leaning on a broken reed, that his subtlety will no longer avail him, although it be the very core and strength of his nature. If he has not sought God, God has sought and found him; and Jacob's first thought is, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy." But God is not his enemy. He is his friend; and, as a friend, He has come to teach him that a higher Wisdom than his own guides and rules the fates of men, and that he must submit to that higher Wisdom before he can be in safety or at peace: that he must no longer trust in himself, in his own craft and policy, but in God, in doing that which is right and good at all hazards and all costs. The conviction comes and grows within him that if he will humble himself before Esau, confess and renounce the wrong he has done him, resolve henceforth to take the plain way of honesty, of right doing, and of trust in the great Lord and Friend of righteousness, he will thus secure the favour of God and man. Let him take this course,

instead of trying to get the better of men and to evade the eye of God, and all will be well with him.

But a man's whole nature is not to be changed at a touch, in a moment, whether for evil or for good; he cannot cast off the inborn or ingrained habit of years without passing through an agony of conflict; and so Jacob strives with his conviction, contends against the God who is rousing and strengthening that conviction within him; he clings to the hope that by the subtlety which is natural to him, which he has long trained and fostered, he may yet hit on some crafty and ingenious scheme by which he may save himself out of the hands of Esau. It is not till he is faint with the long struggle, and God touches and breaks the very sinew of his strength, making him at once helpless and conscious of his helplessness, that he yields, submits himself to the wisdom and will of the righteous Lord, and consents to abandon the crooked by-path of crast and policy for the beaten way of honesty.

(2) But when he is overcome, shall he not in his turn overcome? Yes; for this defeat is in very deed a victory. When, by the cares and sorrows, the fears and perils of life, we have been constrained to submit our wills to the will of God, to prefer his will to our own, God Himself becomes ours and all that is his. When we no longer trust in any power, or wisdom, or craft, or dexterity, that we have acquired, but resolve to trust only in doing that which is right and in Him who favours and blesses all righteousness, all things work together for our good; we call in to our help all the forces of the universe; we become princes with God. The very moment, though it is commonly long before that auspicious moment comes, that we "weep and make

supplication to Him"—weep over our previous departures from the way of righteousness, and ask him to put us into that way and keep us in it, we have power with God and with man, and prevail. We fling away the broken reeds on which we have leaned, and settle into our true strength. For sooner or later God's righteous will must be done on earth even as it is done in heaven; and when his will is done ours will be done too, since we have made his will our own.

The choice and admirable saying of an old rabbi, himself a descendant of Jacob, is true then: "Do thou God's will as though it were thine, and thou shalt find Him doing thy will as though it were his." And this was the truth which Jacob was now being taught. God had wrestled with him till He had wrested from him that trust in his own subtlety which had been the bane of his life; and now Jacob finds that he can wrestle with God, that his old and vain self-confidence is being replaced with a strange new strength, that when he is weak then is he strong. No sooner has he resolved to take God's way rather than his own than he feels that all is well with him, and will be well. God is his friend; and even Esau can but do God's will.

Who can say with what purpose Esau came out from the fastnesses of Edom, with his four hundred men? Why did he bring four hundred brave and reckless freebooters in his train? Was it only because he was accustomed to ride forth attended thus? Was it only that he wished to shew Jacob what a great man he had grown, and to take the innocent revenge of dazzling his crafty brother's eyes with his state and splendour? We commonly assume that Esau harboured none but

^z Hosea xii. 4.

innocent and generous intentions towards Jacob. But what warrant have we for that? Who can say that Esau, the hunter and the nomad, did not cherish in his heart an enmity against his "supplanter" such as many of his descendants have nursed through long years, and come forth from his mountain haunt to indulge it now that the whirligig of time had brought round the propitious hour? I do not affirm that he did; but I can very well believe that he did. I can very well believe, therefore, that, besides the inward answer to his prayer, in the changed character wrought upon him, in the lifting of the centre of rest from himself to God, Jacob received an outward answer to his prayer. Even those who doubt whether our supplications move God to vary or alter the laws of the physical universe cannot doubt that the Great Spirit, the Father of our spirits, may lay his finger on our spirits, and touch, and trouble, and purify the springs of thought and emotion within us. And therefore it is not impossible, even on their hypothesis, that, if Esau did come out cherishing thoughts of revenge, and intending to gratify his ancient grudge against his brother, God, by a dream in the night, by quickening and illuminating the records of memory, by opening the gates of pure natural emotion, may have reversed the whole current of his thoughts and moved him to change his intent. Who can tell what fond and happy recollections of childhood were stirred within the soul of Esau as he lay in his tent on the night before he encountered Jacob? And when he saw the long-absent, and perhaps long-hated, brother limping towards him, a weak and wearied man, aged with toil and care before his time, who can tell what share God had in producing that rush of pure

and generous emotion which flung Esau on to his brother's neck, so that the two men kissed each other and wept together as they had done when they were boys playing about their father's feet? For all that we can tell it may be that it was that very "halting in the thigh" which most touched the heart of the bold and active hunter, to whom the loss of free vigorous motion must have seemed one of the worst of ills: and in that case Jacob owed his safety to the sinew which shrank at the touch of his Divine Antagonist so as to put the hollow of his thigh out of joint; in that case his safety was the direct result of that strange wrestling beyond the Ford. But, in any case, Jacob was safe now that he had consented to the will of God, and had replaced self-confidence by confidence in Him. Even if the worst had come to the worst, and Esau had slain Jacob, as twenty years before he had threatened to do in his fury, even that could have done him no real harm now that he was of one will with Him who is the God of the dead as well as of the living—nay, of Him who is not the God of the dead simply because all, even those whom we call dead, live unto Him. To be at peace with Him is to be secure under all changes to the very last, and in all worlds, most of all in the world invisible.

If, then, we revert to the question with which we started, and ask "How shall we name this story?" Shall we call it "Jacob wrestling with God," as most people do; or shall we call it "God wrestling with Jacob"? I think we may reply, "It should bear both titles; but if we must choose one of the two, we will call it, not 'Jacob wrestling with God,' but 'God wrestling with Jacob,' since it was God who came to

Jacob, not Jacob who went to God; and because the main intent of the story is not to shew us man wringing a gift from the reluctant hand of God, but God graciously constraining man to accept a gift higher and more precious than he had desired or conceived, by compelling him to give up self-trust for trust in the Lord."

This, indeed, is the meaning, or one of the gracious meanings, of all the losses, conflicts, fears by which we are exercised. So long as things go smoothly and happily with us, we are apt to assume, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, that that is owing to some happy or superior quality in ourselves, rather than to the grace and bounty of God. If other men suffer or fail, we are not much surprised; we can generally see to what folly or weakness, what lack of skill or defect of character, it is to be attributed. We assume that there is no such lack in ourselves; that we are capable of handling not our own affairs only, but much larger affairs, if only we had the chance. And so we pass on our way in a happy self-confidence and selfcomplacence, and form a habit of believing in ourselves, and taking our own way, and being impatient with those who question the wisdom of it, which is a sore let and hindrance to our spiritual culture and growth, since it arrests that solicitous endeavour to ascertain what the will of God is, that we may do it, which is the open secret of righteousness. Let no man complain of any loss, care, fear, of any crisis and conflict in his history, which lowers his self-will or his self-confidence, which constrains him to feel his own helplessness, his constant need of a Divine guidance and support. The very kindest thing that God can do for us, the greatest gift He can confer upon us, is, by whatever painful discipline, to drive us out of that easy smiling self-content, to lift our wills into a fuller harmony and concert with his will, to compel us to say, from the heart and in our lives, "Thy will, not ours, be done." For when once God has so far prevailed with us as that, we shall prevail with Him, we shall gain power both with God and man. We shall not then have to wring a reluctant gift from Him; He will already have conferred his greatest gift on us, the gift which includes or guarantees all others. A man cradled and lapped in good fortune may lose all that he has at any moment, and by a thousand different strokes of change; he, therefore, is not the man most blessed of God. But he whose will blends with God's will, and whose feet take and keep the ways of God-this man is both truly and most greatly blessed; for since all changes are ruled by God, and express his will, no change can injure him; he sits with God in the heavenly places, high above the reach of change; and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, fills and satisfies his heart. NIGER.

STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

XIII. - JERICHO AND JERUSALEM.

THE mission to Bethany had been one of danger and of mercy: of danger to Jesus, of mercy to the sisters who had loved and lost. In their home sorrow had been turned into joy; their brother lived and their Friend was present.

From every house the neighbours met, The streets were fill'd with joyful sound, A solemn gladness even crown'd The purple brows of Olivet.

But over in Jerusalem another spirit reigned. Into the city the strange news had been carried. Through the bazaars and the market-place, from gate to gate, and home to home, into the temple and the schools the whisper ran, "Behold, a man raised up by Christ!" The common people heard it gladly, and said, "Lo, a sign from heaven; the Son of David has come; He will break the yoke of the oppressor, and we shall be free." Tumult was in the air, and the priests knew it; a great spiritual act by a great spiritual Person had blown the slumbering political desires of the multitude into flame, and the scribes felt the glowing heat underfoot. The Pharisees were anti-Roman, loved to foster in Israel dislike of the alien and devotion to the hopes and ideals proper to the people of God; but they could only fear and oppose a movement that might end in saluting Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ. The Sadducees were tolerant to Rome, knew, feared, obeyed her, and dreaded nothing so much as the revolt that might rouse her unpitying wrath. So the ancient rivals, united by common hate for hateful ends, met to plot. No man comprehended the situation better than Caiaphas, highpriest that fateful year; and he, cynically, though diplomatically enough, formulated the need of the hour-"It is expedient that one man die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." What he meant was this: "We are on the eve of disaster; the enthusiasm of the people for this Galilean will carry them into revolt, unless we strike it through the heart by bringing him to death." The scribes and Pharisees understood the priest, complimented his astuteness by adopting his policy and working out his scheme. They

¹ John xi. 49, 50.

did not mean to be bad, only patriotic, and so obedient to the maxim. "Salus populi suprema est lex." It was in this heroic spirit that the ancient enemies, who so cordially despised each other, made their covenant, and as new but dear friends assumed their parts in what was to be a drama at once more infamous and more glorious than they knew. Their expedient was both to succeed and fail. The one man was to die for the people, but the nation was to perish. The eternal righteousness that restrains the wrath of man, and even forces it to praise Him, was to turn their selfish expedient into a Divine Sacrifice, which, while it saved man, was only to help the more surely to throw their proud city under the iron heel and devouring torch of Rome. So in the wisdom of God does a soul of good issue from things evil to do the will alike of his mercy and justice.

But Christ knew that though his hour was at hand, it was not yet come. The Prophet was not to perish out of Jerusalem, or in it, save at his own time. So He withdrew "into a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim," and there waited the coming of the feast that was to mark the moment of his sacrifice. When the roads were thronged with pilgrims from Greece and Egypt, from Italy and Gaul, from Spain and Syria, He, too, turned his face to the holy city, and began his great march to brief bitter death and eternal glorious power. For the time He had become an enigma to his disciples. They could not understand his sorrow, especially as they were still living in the sunshine of his greatest miracle. In his supreme moments society was impossible to Christ.

He lived in an atmosphere where human sympathy had to sleep or die, and the human voice to speak unheard. The grief of God is too deep for the thought of man. He who embodied the first could only be a riddle to the second. Life by death, salvation by sacrifice, were truths lying outside the horizon of the spirits then around Christ. The feeling that made Peter rebuke Iesus at the first mention of his sufferings was common, was, too, finely natural.1 Why should He speak of suffering and death? What need had He who had raised Lazarus to die? So his words seemed mysterious, enigmatical, created shadows of the mind all the deeper because of the recent sunshine. Like men puzzled, they became bewildered, dubious, suspicious, feeling as if they were threatened by evils they had no right to anticipate. St. Mark, after his manner, gives us a glance of real and living insight into the sacred circle just at the moment the pilgrimage of sorrow began: "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid."2 With their expectations unfulfilled, without the experience that could act as interpreter or guide, perplexed by hearing prophecy contradict miracle, and seeing miracle contradict prophecy, they grew bewildered, astonished, doubtful, fell out of fellowship with their Master, and left Him to begin his high and glorious way alone. The shadow that rested on his Spirit so awed and "amazed" theirs that they could not walk by his side, or listen with quick interpretive sympathy to his speech, could only follow after, full of uneasy fears, with thoughts they could speak to each other, but not

Matt. xvi. 22.

² Mark x. 32.

to Him. Yet though they were reluctant learners, the suffering that was to make Him perfect was teaching them. He could not leave them in the pleasant illusions their fancies had woven out of their own desires and his great deeds. To do so had been worse cruelty, had made the awakening an awakening to sorrow that could never have blossomed into joy. And so he turns ever to them with his unwelcome speech of suffering, death, and resurrection, leaving time to be his interpreter. The process was painful, but from it almost all were to come forth purified, one alone was to issue dark in soul, angry in spirit, prepared for worst and darkest deeds, yet with goodness enough in him to be remorseful, and pass hence to his own place, not a seared and conscienceless ruffian, but an anguished and self-despising man, who had by fell experiment made the dreadful discovery that to no man is evil so bad as to the evil-doer.

The miracle at Bethany was thus a centre whence had issued the most conflicting influences; and we must watch their operation in the various circles, friendly, indifferent, inimical, that surround Jesus. Within his own society it created the high hopes that listened amazed, incredulous, to his prophetic words. The disciples found it more agreeable to believe the eye than the ear: on the act they could place their own interpretation, which was so much happier than any meaning they could get out of his speech. The miracle was a prophecy in act, signifying that the hour of his power was at hand. In its light certain former words of his were re-read and made by their quickened imaginations to speak the thing they

wished. The Palingenesia, in their sense, was as good as here; the twelve thrones as good as seen, and they seated judging the twelve tribes of Israel. How heedless the new ambitions were of the new prophecies an event significantly shews. He had hardly ceased speaking of the betrayal and death, when Salome, with her sons, came to him, saying, "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, the other on thy left, in thy kingdom."2 The nearest to Him were yet far from Him; even love was too blind to divine the truth; and so in his answer there seems to live the infinite sadness of a spirit not understood, where understanding is life: "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Their answer is a tragic revelation of ignorance, and the vain courage that is born of it: "We are able." They did not dream of Gethsemane and the cross, but of the chalice of victory, the baptism that consecrated the throne and purified for judgment. For these they were "able"—qualified for the highest seats, offices, acts in the kingdom. Men who think themselves equal to rule are often found unequal to obedience; and so this conscious ability for the throne was soon to be proved inability to serve in suffering and obey in sacrifice. They did not know that men must suffer with Christ before they could reign with Him; and, in their ignorance, they wished to reign before they had been perfected. And the truth He stated: they were to drink of his cup, and be baptized with his baptism; his agony and cross were to be theirs; in Him and with Him

¹ Matt. xix. 28-30. ² Matt. xx. 21.

they were to suffer. Fellowship with Him in life involved fellowship with Him in death, and as the joy of the first had been, the sorrow of the second would be. But the seat on his right hand or his left was not an absolute or arbitrary, but a conditional gift; it was reserved for those "for whom it is prepared of my Father." The reward was to the worthiest; proximity was to depend on affinity. His must suffer with Him, if they were to "be glorified together." I But his words were as yet a parable whose meaning they could not read; the Cross, with the mingled agonies and joys that followed it, was needed to teach them. The brothers, puzzled, turned to face the disciples; the disciples, angry, turned to rebuke the brothers; all confused, bewildered to listen to the words, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for the many."2 A generation later, one of the men who stood there as in a dream, with a deed of highest power in his memory, visions of judicial glory in his imagination, words of sorrow and death in his ears, was to be a prisoner in Patmos "for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." 3 There, with the blue Ægean all around him, he was still to feel as in the presence of the Son of man, hearing Him speak with a voice like the sound of the multitudinous waves ever breaking in music on the beach. There, too, he was to dream of "dominion and glory," of a heaven that ruled earth, and a Christ that made men "kings and priests unto God and his Father." 4 But

¹ Rom. viii. 17.

² Matt. xx. 27, 28.

³ Rev. i. 9.

⁴ Rev. xx. 1-6.

there he had no vain vision of a throne to him who first claimed it. His visions were now of "a multitude no man could number" "before the throne and before the Lamb." And he does not ask, as of old, for a place, but simply rejoices to hear, "These are they which come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." He knows now what he knew not then: to drink Christ's cup and to share his baptism is to live and reign with Him.

So Jesus begins to go up to Jerusalem with the vision of the cross standing out clear before his own soul, while the disciples dreamt of his kingship and their own coming authority. The pilgrimage that was now beginning was to be his last, a strange contrast to his first. Then he was a boy, full of great wonder, of large questions, of dim foreshadowings of what was to be; now he is a man, who has realized the ideal of humanity the ages behind had been straining after and the ages before were to worship; a man. who has lived his high, holy, lonely life, and is going forward to the death which is to finish the work his Father gave Him to do. Then He was an object of beauty and delight; the nature within Him rejoiced. and nature without whispered to Him her divinest secrets; now He is like a root out of the dry ground. without the beauty that awakens desire, "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." Then man turned to Him his best and most amiable side, as man ever does to a child; parents were trustful, neighbours kindly, the very doctors of the temple gentle, admiring, fond, won by the winsomeness of the glorious

¹ Rev. vii. 14.

boy: now that his physical is sublimed into spiritual loveliness, they can see in Him nothing to admire; leave Him so unloved that he feels more homeless than the fox that, when hunted, can hide in the earth. or the bird that can sit and sing to its brooding mate. And his homelessness was now becoming loneliness: the men that had known Him were ceasing to know, dreaming dreams that made them unconscious of the realities that awed his spirit. Earth has its changes for every man, but to whom did it change as to Thee, O Thou Lamb of God? Heaven was about Thy infancy; may we not say, hell was about Thy manhood? In Thy cradle Thou didst hear the song of the heavenly host; but on the cross Thou wert to hear the hoarse and angry cries of men who mocked Thy sufferings and demanded Thy death.

Yet when the pilgrimage began it seemed a triumphal procession. The spirit that lived in the disciples possessed the multitude, and the fame of this great miracle clothed Him to their eyes in the attributes of the expected Messiah. So we see Him approaching Jericho, on his way from Ephraim to Jerusalem, the centre of a wondering crowd. Though He still bears the name "Jesus of Nazareth," it is used as if big with latent significance. Curiosity is on tiptoe, and reigns over rich and poor alike. As He enters, a blind beggar invokes his aid. The multitude, vain of their wonder, wished to silence him; the person they marvelled at must be above hearing a blind man's prayer. But the "Son of David" heard and healed, and the people, gratified while surprised, only the more "gave praise unto God." As He passes through

¹ Luke xviii. 35—36.

Jericho the crowd thickens, and a rich publican, determined to see Jesus, but unable to do it for the crowd, climbs up into a sycamore tree. He was a very different man from Bartimæus; notice of him was a far more serious thing. The publican was always an offence to the Jew. He was the symbol of bondage, of Gentile conquest and tyranny. He was worse than an outcast; he was one who had sold himself to the alien as an agent of his robbery and oppression. He was a son of Abraham who had not only dishonoured his father, but was helping the heathen to work his death and shame. And to love such a son, nay to recognize his sonship, was to sin against the father and all the hopes represented by his name. But the most hated of the hated race was the rich publican, whose wealth had grown by extortion, who had with unpitying hand robbed the widow and made the orphan destitute. And Zaccheus was a man of this type, an object of horror to the pious and hate to all. It was the right and religious thing to pity and help the beggar, and to despise and avoid the publican. Yet the Jesus who came clothed in fresh glory from his work on Bartimæus suddenly pauses, looks at Zaccheus, invites him to descend and receive Him into his house. The people saw and heard with amazement which deepened into anger; the new horror eclipsed the old admiration, and displeasure silenced praise. Yet the act was one that expressed the Actor's mind, especially in its contrast with the minds about Him, far more forcibly than the most forcible speech. It was symbolical, signified that He had come not to work miracles, but to change men; not to dazzle and delight the curious, but "to seek and save the lost." The

men around Him were saying, "Here is our Messiah; his deeds shew Him to be the power of God. He is on his way to Jerusalem to establish and proclaim his empire, to fulfil our law, to make the Jew the conqueror of the world and the king of man." And He to their evident, though unexpressed, thoughts made answer, "I am come to do, not your will, but My Father's, to be no political, but a spiritual King, to be not the tool of the priest and the scribe, but the Saviour of the fallen and outcast. And look how simply, yet thoroughly, My spiritual work can be done. You have had your will with Zaccheus, hated him, despised him, dealt with him as with a heathen and an alien, and he has answered your hatred with extortion, your anathemas with oppression, your censures with heavier exactions. But see how potent are gentle words and gracious acts; under them the bad publican becomes the good Hebrew, dutiful to Israel and obedient to the law of love, giving half his goods to feed the poor, and restoring fourfold what he had wrongfully obtained." Yet the results only aggravated the offence. To fanaticism good done in ways that displease it is no better than evil, or rather worse, inasmuch as fatal to its exclusive claims to be right. So Jesus, to get at the root of the matter, strikes at their false hopes the thought "that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." He would not go to Jerusalem as their Messiah, to be in their sense the Christ. The Jews had been citizens of the Divine kingdom, servants of the King. Their duty was to develope its resources, guard his interests, and extend his authority. Some had done so. Lawgivers and

prophets had splendidly served the ideals and ends of the kingdom of God; but one, the one, too, in possession, had not. He, the living Jew, had bound the eternal truth in his napkin of legal maxims and ceremonies, and buried it in the soil of rabbinical and sacerdotal formalism. He feared God as "an austere man" feared to use his trust, and so buried it, cast it out of his spirit into the earth that it might suffer and waste there unused! And Jesus declines to be judged by this faithless servant, claims rather to judge and condemn him; refuses to be measured by his acts and ideas, asserts rather his right to take from him the treasure he had so abused. The Jew had thrown away his splendid opportunity, and now he was to lose it. His infidelity to his trust had, as its punishment, his inability to understand the Christ of God, and now he was to be to the ages the grand illustration of the truth, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him."1

Six days before the Passover the pilgrims reached Bethany, and there paused. Wonder still lived in the village. Love still dwelt in the home of Lazarus. Into it Jesus entered, and there He was consecrated, anointed the Divine Sacrifice which should abolish the old faith and create the new. Love has often a sweet unconscious wisdom, and in its humblest ministries meanings may lie so great as to be visible to the eye of God alone. And here its kinship with the saintliest stood confessed. In these closing hours nothing seems so tragic as the blindness of the disciples, and the clear open vision of the Master as to the doom that

¹ Luke xix. 26.

was to be. They were full of hope in a soon to be manifested glory. He full of prophetic agony as to the death to be endured. Like those who knew his power and believed in its impending final victory, Lazarus and his sisters thought only of a glad welcome to their Friend. The hour was all sunshine; the fast-falling shadow was unseen and unfeared. So his coming was celebrated by a supper, and He who had known the gloom of the grave tasted the deepest joy of his life. But Mary's love, too deep for speech, too great for tears, as if she felt within the joy the cold heart of sorrow, stole, while Martha waited, behind Jesus, and anointed his feet "with ointment of spikenard very costly." I And then, as the fragrance filled the room, strange things became manifest. The feeling that had long slumbered in one breast broke into speech. "Why this waste?" cried Judas. "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor." 2 But the unholy avarice which dared to clothe itself in the form of sacred charity was rebuked by the sad voice which revealed the heart sad by the realized presence of death: "Let her alone, against the day of my burying hath she kept this."

The words of Judas were characteristic—the familiar words of his kind the world over. A work of what seems splendid improvidence may be greater than what seems a work of needed beneficence. Some men cry out against waste when what they mean is some loss to their sordid selves. If the money that bought the "ointment of spikenard" had been "given to the poor" it would have done them little good; but, used as it was, it became the condition of an act which has filled

^z John xii. 3.

the world with its fragrance, and enriched our poverty with one of the loveliest deeds of devotion. In Mary and Iudas two opposite spirits live: in the one, a love to Christ that seeks to live for Him; in the other, a love to self that means to use rather than serve Him. For Mary to give, for Judas to receive, was to be blessed, To the one, Christ's suffering was a welcome opportunity for service; to the other, a detested occasion of weakness, an inexplicable and disastrous moment of failure. Mary is an ideal disciple, one with love great enough to transform Jesus of Nazareth into the Christ of Christianity; Judas is the type of the disciple by accident, seeking by association with Christ personal advantage rather than assimilation to Him. And the results of the discipleship were to be tragically unlike: a growing joy to Mary, a growing misery to Judas. In the society of Jesus she found a congenial home, but he an irritating and hateful element. As his nature and Christ's developed alongside each other, their dissimilarities and antipathies must have become ever more pronounced. The man must slowly have come to feel himself an alien; and as truth dawned upon him, he would be first bewildered, then wretched, feeling like Satan among the sons of God, only without the serene cynicism that could sneer at eternal goodness in its very presence and to its very face; or rather like an evil spirit, moody and melancholy, who had strayed into a circle of angels, where the contrast of their light and his darkness deepens his misery tenfold. A man that so feels is near to despair, and may do the deed of the desperate. When the last hope perishes, the desperation that seeks revenge and begets remorse is sure to come. For Judas the moment is at hand. If Jerusalem does not reveal Jesus as the Messiah, he will forswear Him, forsake his society, destroy himself, and be over and done with the profitless misery that is now paralyzing spirit and spoiling life. So within the chosen circle devotion waited to be perfected by suffering, and disappointment to be avenged by treason.

On the next day Jesus entered Jerusalem. The part of the pilgrim band that had gone forward carried into the city the news of his coming, and the people, all enthusiasm for the "Son of David," the Man who had raised the dead, prepared for Him a fitting welcome. Those who had passed the night at Bethany joined the circle that surrounded the Master, partook of its spirit, and shared its hopes. As they ascended Olivet, feeling as if they had in their midst the sent of God, the salvation of Israel, they were joined by pilgrims hastening to the feast, and on the summit they were met by the multitudes who had sallied from the city to meet the advancing Christ. The enthusiasm grew as the crowd increased; clothes were spread, palm-branches scattered in his path, and as each fresh stream blended with the river, the shout rose, "Hosannah! Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord." That might have seemed the proudest moment in the life of Jesus, the moment when the homage of man was most spontaneous and most real; but, in truth, it was one of the saddest. The enthusiasm only deepened his solitude, made it more awful to his spirit, while throwing upon the coming events a more tragic colouring. Their praise was pain, for what they praised was the idol of their own imaginations, not the Christ who was coming to suffer and to die. In the midst of

John xii. 13.

their joy He rode possessed of the vivid consciousness that the discovery of the truth would change their jubilant cry of welcome into the delirious shout of passion and revenge. So, as they swept round the shoulder of the hill, and the city burst upon his view, turreted, temple-crowned, lying white and radiant in the glorious sunlight, hallowed by a thousand sacred memories, darkened by a thousand sins, the pathos of the place and the moment, the then and the to be, the ideal and the actual, the men and city as they seemed and as they were, was more than his heart could bear, and He wept, saying, "If thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." I

Once within the city, the great drama began to unfold its successive acts. Jesus asserted his authority as the Christ by purging the temple and teaching in it.² The enthusiasm of the people paralyzed the priests and the Sanhedrin. 3 They could not as yet use popular passion against Him, and so they cautiously assailed Himself, seeking to involve Him in conflict with the multitude, or with Rome, or with Moses. Their first point was to question his authority. Whence had He it? Who gave it?4 He replied by subtly revealing the purpose of their question and their consequent inability to judge his truth: "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men?" If they said, "From heaven," they condemned their own unbelief; if "Of men," they broke with the people—a dangerous thing while they were moved with Messianic enthusiasm and inspired by Messianic hopes. So they could

¹ Luke xix. 42.

³ Ibid. 47, 48; Mark xi. 18.

² Ibid. 45-47.

⁴ Luke xx. 1, 2; Mark xi. 25, 26.

only plead ignorance. But how could men too ignorant to judge of the Baptist's claims judge as to Christ's? The next point was political—an attempt to find occasion for "delivering him into the power and authority of the governor." The men chosen for this work were, significantly enough, "Pharisees and Herodians."2 The Pharisees were a religious, the Herodians a political, party. The former were the exponents and representatives of the ancient theocratic ideal: the latter, the adherents of the house of Herod. The Pharisees hated the alien, believed that there could be no true king in Israel, unless he came of the family of David; the Herodians served and upheld the kinghood of the alien, the brood of the cruel and abhorred Idumean. The Pharisees stood in absolute antagonism to Rome. To them its sovereignty was the worst bondage, the dominion of the heathen over the people of God; but the Herodians accepted, diplomatically at least, the authority that had placed the sons of Herod in their respective kingdoms or tetrarchies. Now these parties, thus radically opposed, combined against Jesus, submitting this question, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?"3 On this point they were divided. The Pharisees held it wrong, but the Herodians held it right, at least as a matter of political expediency. Hence they would, with fine innocence, submit their difference to his arbitrament. But the innocence masked a deep design. If He said, "It is lawful," He would offend the people and the strongest and noblest national beliefs and hopes; if He said, "It is not lawful," He would come into collision with Rome, the power

¹ Luke xx. 2c. ² Mark xii. 13. ³ Luke xx. 22; Mark xii. 14.

that, with equal ease and equal coldness, crushed its least and its greatest opponent, and then passed serenely on. But it is not in the nature of wisdom to play into the hands of cunning. He said, "Show me a denarius," and asked, "Whose is the image and superscription?" "Cæsar's." "Then the coin is his—minted, issued by him, used, circulated by you. It is a coin by his act, is, too, regarded and treated by you as money, and therefore the question is none. The use of Cæsar's money is tribute to Cæsar. Render to him his, and to God God's."

But though the Pharisees were vanquished, the Sadducees were, if not of a subtler, of an astuter race. They had been educated in a fine contempt for vulgar superstitions, the traditions and doctrines for which the Pharisees were so zealous. They did not believe in development or a continuous revelation. God had spoken to Moses, but had been silent ever since. The Law embodied his will; what was not law was of man. not of God. And so they were exceedingly jealous for Moses, and exceedingly jealous of "the traditions of the fathers." They had hitherto left the conflict with Jesus to the Pharisees, rather pleased that their rivals should be so beset and bewildered; but now that Caiaphas had declared his death to be necessary, they would confront and overpower Him with the authority of their Lawgiver. They selected their point carefully. Jesus had explicitly affirmed his belief in a future state, 1 and the Pharisees were here weak, for they believed as firmly as He. But the Sadducees were strong; they did not find the belief in Moses, found it, indeed, conspicuously absent and explicitly disproved. So they

¹ Luke xvi. 19-31.

elaborated their most conclusive argument, and presented it thus: "Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore seven brethren; and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife." The case was a splendid one for discussion in the schools, excellent for the exercise of subtle wits. If there is a future state where all these husbands are alive, and this poor overmarried woman alive also, "whose wife shall she be? Come now, good Master, tell us." They did not raise the question whether immortal relations must be adjusted to provisional arrangements; they took for granted that a temporary and barbarous expedient was an eternal law. Yet their own hearts might have answered their question. We may imagine in the company that came to Jesus a young Sadducee with the wistful sadness in his eyes that can be seen only where the light that has gladdened life has been extinguished. He has known the joy of possession and the agony of loss. A gentle womanly presence had once made his manhood beautiful, his home happy, his life rich with sweet and soothing grace. But just when his joy was deepest, hateful death had come, and left him sitting dumb in the shadow of a great affliction. The first desolation is past, but only that a level and

¹ Luke xx. 28-33.

cheerless melancholy might come, which forces ever to his lips the cry—

O for the touch of a vanished hand And the sound of a voice that is still!

Yet no hand is stretched through the darkness, no voice answers out of the eternal silence; and he can only mourn—

The tender grace of a day that is dead Will never come back to me.

But had such an one been in the company, would not the longing, the strong desire, that could almost create the belief in immortality, born of necessity and the very nature of his own spirit, have made him loathe the cruel frivolity of the case supposed, with its primitive and provisional law, and listen for words that might shed upon his own sorrow the consolation of a great hope? And if he had been there, he would not have been disappointed. Jesus lifted the question into a region above the heaven of the Sadducean spirit. They erred through ignorance. I He recognized no sanctity, no universal and eternal validity, in the law of a semi-civilized people. In the resurrection men were not governed by the law of Moses; they were "as the angels of God." Their natures determined their relations, affinities created society. And the Highest was the regulative nature. The living God involved the life of those that lived to Him. Men who lived in communion with Him became as needful to Him as He was to them. And this truth was expressed in the ancient saying, "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." He could not be their God unless He was a real Being to them; they could not be real beings to Matt. xxii. 29.

Him unless they still lived. To be the God of them, He must be a God to them; and He could be a God only to living persons, not to silent memories or empty names.

Jesus thus found immortality at the very heart of the Mosaic law, involved in the distinctive name of God, Jehovah, the living, the creative. The Sadducees erred because they did not know God. If they had rightly conceived Him, they had strongly believed in the immortal being of man. The man who is made in the image of God is made to be as God, and be like Him for ever. The thought embodied in his answer was so new and strange to the Sadducees that it was almost like an answer in an unknown tongue. They were silenced, bewildered, and humiliated before the multitude, who "were astonished at his doctrine." I

And so his enemies could not so involve Him either with the people or with Cæsar or with Moses, as to carry through their expedient. But what they failed to do his own revelation of Himself accomplished. The revelation was double, by antipathy and by sympathy, the one shewing what He was not -to the Jews; the other shewing what He was-to his disciples. As regards the first, it was made both by action and speech. He acted like the Man of sorrows, not like the victorious Messiah. There is nothing more marvellous, even in the Gospels, than the self-repression of Jesus in his latest hours. He was in every respect a contrast and contradiction to the Messiah of tradition, and He emphasized, as it were, the points of difference. The homage of ignorance was to Him only latent aversion, and He

could not allow his true nature to remain unknown. And so, the more He revealed Himself, the cooler grew their enthusiasm; the less He fulfilled their expectations, the more dubious, suspicious, watchful for offence they became. And what they wanted they found in his words. His discourses in Jerusalem predicted the overthrow, not the triumph, of Judaism, denounced the hypocrisy that reigned in high places, praised the piety that lived in poverty and seclusion. The city, the temple, the worship, the very people were to perish, and only a remnant was to be saved. False Christs were to rise, be welcomed, believed. followed; confusion was to grow into anarchy, and anarchy to end in death.2 This was strange language for one who claimed to be the Christ to use in Jerusalem, and respecting the Jews. History was to prove it true; but meanwhile it was held worse than the worst falsehood. But while He was becoming to the people as an enemy by telling them the truth, He was privily drawing his disciples round Him, opening to them the inmost secrets of his spirit, the deepest mysteries of his truth. They heard, but were slow of heart to believe. Yet in speaking to the men that were, He spoke to the men that were to be; and words not understood then became in later days words of spirit and life. What estranged the heart of Jerusalem was to draw the heart of the world; and the wisdom of Christ was to be justified to all after ages by the events which proved that his antagonism to Judaism was the sublimest service to man.

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

¹ Matt. xxiii. 13 ff.; Luke xxi. 1-4.

² Luke xxi. 5-24; Matt. xxiv. 3-31.

CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM.

HEBREWS I. I, 2.

"Gop who in various modes and in divers parts spake in time past unto our fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, for whom also he made the ages." Such is the keynote to one of the most remarkable books of the New Testament, and all its subsequent arguments are but the prolonged echoes of its opening strain. We feel irresistibly, on the very threshold of this Epistle, that we are standing between two worlds-an old world which is passing away, and a new world which is dawning. The refrain which is maintained throughout is but the amplification of one pregnant sentence, "Here we have no continuing city." Jerusalem is compassed about with armies; the Jewish age is going out and the Gentile age is coming in. The old forms of thought are fast disappearing, and the glory of the Temple-worship is fading. Roman arms and Greek culture are sapping the foundations of the ancient theocracy, and the culture is even more powerful than the arms. The Writer to the Hebrews stands amid the vanishing forms of a disappearing world, and sees the structure of ten centuries melting in the rays of the Western sun.

No one can read the Epistle without perceiving that the Writer of this book belongs to the Pauline school; in other words, that he has more sympathy with the new age which is coming than with the old age which is going. Yet if we look more closely, we shall find that there is a conservative element amidst his sympathies. His heart is with the future, but the future which claims his heart is one which will absorb rather than divorce the past. He sees clearly that the forms of Judaism were in their very nature transitory and perishable, and that no conjunction of circumstances could ever have made them permanent. But he sees not less clearly that they typified that which could not perish; that they were not illusions, much less delusions, but the shadows of things to come, whose glory all along had been the forecast of the substance which they prefigured. He is prepared to see them fade, but not to fade into nothingness. When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part is done away; yet all the parts exist in the completed whole. So to the eye of this Writer the shadows of Judaism only fade in that light which gave them birth, and yield their borrowed glory to the coming substance which they foreshadowed. He repudiates the notion that he is proclaiming a new system of the universe; he will not even admit that a new voice is speaking. He maintains that from the beginning there has been a continuity of Divine revelation: "God who in times past spoke to our fathers hath in these last days spoken unto us." The voice has never been broken, the accents have never been interrupted; there has simply been a change in tone and modulation, as the ear of the listener developed from the organ of a child into the sense of a mature man.

But, having conceded so much to the spirit of Judaism, the Writer of this Epistle proceeds to exhibit the vast advance which the last stage of the revelation has made upon its earlier stages. He goes on to enumerate the different points in which the Divine voice in Christianity is distinguished from the Divine voice in Judaism, and in every one of these points he

finds the advantage on the side of the former. It seems to us that he has succeeded in pointing out four distinct grounds of superiority. (1) He says that the Jewish revelation was not uniform in its appearance, but given in "various modes;" whereas the revelation of Christ was given in the continuous image of a single human form. (2) He declares that the Jewish revelation did not exhibit a united view of the universe, but was made in "divers parts;" whereas the manifestation of Christ was the revelation of one connected life. (3) He maintains that Judaism was only a temporary manifestation of God: "He spoke unto our fathers in times past;" whereas Christianity was the centre of all epochs, past, present, and future: "whom he hath appointed heir of all things, for whom also he made the ages." (4) He affirms that Judaism did not give the Divine Voice from the fountain-head: God spoke to our fathers only by "the prophets;" whereas in Christianity we have the Voice direct from heaven, because we have the revelation made from the brightness of his own glory: "hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son."

r. The Writer says that the Jewish Revelation was not uniform in its appearance. It approached the mind of the prophet not in one aspect, but in "various modes." Sometimes it came to him in a dream of the night, sometimes in a vision of the day, sometimes through a type or symbol, sometimes in a historical event, occasionally perhaps by an inward suggestion made in the silence of the soul. These were merely isolated messages. They declared the will of God, but not the mind of God. They announced the Divine law in relation to particular acts, but they did not reveal

that principle of the Divine law which is the reason even of the will of God, and regulates all acts. To reveal such a principle was to lay bare the Divine Heart itself, and that demanded another form of reve-There is only one way in which the workings of a mind can be revealed to a human being, and that is through the form of humanity. There may be other modes of communication for other intelligences, but there is no other mode given under heaven whereby intelligence can be known to man. To man, who is a person, there can, strictly speaking, be no revelation of that which is impersonal. He can tell some requirements of the beast of the field; he can put his hand on many of the laws of nature: but he knows neither the life of the one nor the substance of the other. Judaism could lay its hand upon the laws of God, but it was too philosophical to attempt the unveiling of the Lawgiver. Its very conception of God precluded it from such an aim. He was the self-contained, self-existent Jehovah; incomprehensible, unspeakable, dwelling in a light whose glory was the fact that it was inaccessible. He was incapable of being seen in Himself, incapable of being known in Himself, incapable even of being named. All his acts towards man were but symbolic acts; they expressed not his nature, but his will; not the manner of his thoughts, but the manner in which He desired the creation to think of Him. The God of developed Judaism was the God of Dr. Mansel and Sir William Hamilton — the Being whose presence we can know, but whose nature is unknowable; whose commands we may receive, but the principle of whose commands is ever hid from our eyes. Judaism could approach Him only in the outer court of the Tabernacle, in the "various modes" by which He indicated his sovereign will; but the inner court of the Sanctuary was for ever veiled from view, and the Fatherhood behind the sovereignty was unseen, unfelt, unknown.

Now Christianity claims to have unveiled this Presence, and to have unveiled it in the only way in which it can be disclosed to a human soul—by personification. "God manifest in the flesh" is the keynote of the Christian Revelation. There for the first time in the history of Judaism the human speaks to the human. For the first time in the exercise of his religion the soul of the worshipper is brought into direct contact with the object of his worship; receives no longer his messages, but becomes recipient of his revelations; obeys no longer his will, but reads his heart. In the human manifestation of the Divine he finds the one and only form in which his human soul can actually meet with God; and just because the one essential form has come, the many accidental modes of communication drop away. The perfect manifestation takes up into itself the broken and imperfect voices. The dream fades in the reality, the vision melts in the tangible image, the type is lost in the antitype, the historical event is merged in One who professes to be the source of history: "God who in various modes spoke to our fathers hath spoken unto us through the image of a man."

2. The Writer to the Hebrews now passes on to consider the second point of comparison between Christianity and Judaism. He tells us that the Judaic revelation was partial and fragmentary; that it presented to the mind of the worshipper a divided view of the universe; to use his own words, that it was

made in "divers parts." This is all the more remarkable from the fact that the God of Judaism was a Being of absolute will. It might have been expected that a religion whose leading feature was the recognition of Divine Sovereignty, would have recognized, above everything else, the unity of plan in the universe. But the truth is, there was an element in this world which the Jewish mind revolted from, and which, with all its Theocratic tendencies, it had the utmost difficulty in referring to a Divine agency at all; that element was the existence of suffering. That the sufferings of this present life were a preparation for the glory to be revealed; that the dark shades in human destiny were an essential part of the great universal plan; that the sorrows which beset humanity were themselves workers together with joy for the good of humanity, was a thought which it never entered into the heart of the Jew to conceive. There are traces of its advent indeed in the later Judaism, and notably in the book of Job, where the central thought seems to be the possibility that human suffering may have a deeper root than human evil; but the very existence of such a modification is itself a proof that Judaism had then become incorporated with foreign elements. The essential character of the religion is the sharp line of demarcation it draws between sorrow and joy. All the connection between them is that they come from one common source; they do not proceed from one common plan. They are both sent by God, but they are sent for opposite purposes; joy to reward, sorrow to punish. Joy is the blessing which the Theocratic government bestows on goodness; sorrow is the penalty which the Theocratic

government affixes to the transgression of its laws. Hence to the Jewish mind there is always in the hour of calamity something more painful than the calamity itself: the deepest pain is the inference derived from it. When Paul says, "The sting of death is sin," he expresses the sentiment of every pious Israelite. The bitterness of death, the bitterness of every physical, mental, and moral affliction, lay outside of itself, consisted in the fact that the affliction was the symbol of the Divine anger and the mark of the Divine vengeance. The going back of the shadow on the dial was not merely, nor even chiefly, hailed as a promise of recovery from sickness; its highest promise was this, that it rolled a cloud from the Divine countenance, and restored to the sufferer the sense of God's favour. Joy and sorrow were both the angels of the Eternal, but each was appointed to rule a different department of the universe. They never met together in the performance of one work; the one was ever the angel of blessing, the other was ever the angel of retribution. The result was that the vision of the prophet was the vision of a divided universe. He saw the history of the world separated into two parallel lines. On the one side he beheld the earth crowned with blessings; on the other he saw it smitten with plague, pestilence, and famine; one basked in sunshine, the other lay in shadow. There was no possibility that the sunshine should ever issue from the shadow. Sorrow might at any time give place to joy, but it could never work out joy. The life of pleasure was separated as effectually from the life of pain as if the world had actually been ruled by two opposite principles of light and darkness. Hence it is that the prophetic writings of

the Old Testament exhibit such strange, such sudden, transitions from the height to the valleys, from exultation to despair. No man can listen to the outpourings of the Psalmist without being impressed with the presence of two contending influences-a God-attracting and a God-repelling power. In the brief compass of a few verses the alternations are often startling. One moment he is basking in the unclouded light, the next he is plunged in an abyss of darkness. One moment he is inspired by the Divine nearness, the next he is crying out, "How long, O Lord! how long! Why art thou so far from helping me?" In the fragmentary nature of Jewish Revelation, it could hardly be otherwise. If prosperity was the sign of God's favour, and adversity the sign of his displeasure, what else could human life present than the alternating aspect of Divine nearness and Divine separation? The joys and sorrows of life divide the hours of every day; if the Divine plan of human development be referred exclusively to its joys, the hours of no day can reveal an unbroken religious rest.

But here again Christianity steps in as an arbiter. As it reconciled the "various modes" in one form, so now it reconciles the "divers parts" in one revelation. Let us understand how this reconciliation is effected. Christianity holds as distinctly as Judaism that there is an intimate and indissoluble connection between sin and suffering; but it does not hold that there is an indissoluble connection between suffering and sin. It maintains, like Judaism, that wherever there is transgression there must be sorrow; but it denies the converse, that wherever there is sorrow there must necessarily be transgression. Christianity does not

annul the Jewish conception, but it adds something to that conception; and the element which it adds is all important. It agrees with Judaism in holding that sorrow is the penalty of sin; but it goes on to say that the penalty itself may become remedial, that the cross of expiation may lead back to the crown of glory. The thought has a philosophical as well as a religious importance: it brings back suffering within the range of the Divine plan. The moment punishment is contemplated as a possible remedy, it is contemplated as a part of individual development. It ceases any longer to be outside the circle of the universe; it assumes a new attitude in relation to human progress. Its mission is no longer merely that of an avenger of the past; it has found an additional work as a pioneer of the future. Christianity, accordingly, exhibits a united universe. Sorrow and joy cease to have a separate work; they become the steps of one common process; they work together for good. To make the unity more complete, it is exhibited in the revelation of a single life. A man of pre-eminent sorrows becomes, through his sorrows, the source of universal jovs. A being of all others the most afflicted proclaims his cross to be the world's crown, and under the deepest shadow of that cross bequeaths to the world a peace which passes its comprehension. The ancient glory of Jewish prosperity ceases to be the soul's ideal, but in its room there rises the ideal of a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; the old motive had been the search of happiness, the new stimulus is to be the pursuit of blessedness. Yet this new search, unlike the former one, is to take sorrow as its guide; the weight of glory is to be worked out by

affliction. Christ is the revealer of a new dispensation; and He is Himself the first-fruit of the dispensation. He comes into the world with a joy set before Him; but it is a joy which He can only secure when He has endured the cross and despised the shame. In that connection the cross loses its shame, and the world loses its dualism. The dark shades which had constituted one hemisphere of history fade into the unbroken circle of a cloudless universe; and the Writer to the Hebrews, as he surveys the transformation, describes thus the absorption of the partial in the perfect: "God who in divers parts spoke to our fathers hath spoken unto us in the revelation of a united life."

3. We come now to the third point of comparison between Christianity and Judaism. The Jewish Revelation is here said to have been in itself merely temporary: "in times past." It was not given for the world as a world, but for a portion of the world at a particular epoch. It was one of those revelations which are only meant to be true for the age to which they speak, but which cease to have any significance for the ages to come. In this respect also the Writer to the Hebrews proceeds to draw a contrast between the first and the second revelation. He declares that the new light which was dawning had all along been existing behind the old lights, and that all the radiance of the old lights had been borrowed from this source. The entire scope and aim of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the enunciation of the truth that Christianity was from the beginning the goal of Judaism. When he says, "There remaineth a rest to the people of God," he is not, as the reader popularly supposes,

speaking of the future state of the soul; he is speaking of the future state of Judaism, which, in his view. was Christianity. What he means to say is simply this: "Do not imagine that the promises made by God in the Old Testament have ever been fulfilled in that Testament. He has said more to your nation than has ever yet been performed; "there remaineth a rest to the people of God." You have had many rests in your journey through the wilderness; you have had the semblance of a permanent rest in the land of Canaan; but has the semblance proved a reality? He has promised you the full and absolute possession of a land flowing with milk and honey: has that promise ever been fulfilled? have you up to this hour possessed the entire land of Palestine? He has promised you a seed like the sands of the sea in multitude: has that promise been fulfilled? Is it not with difficulty that you can detect a remnant of the lineage of David? He has promised you a kingdom that will never be moved, and a king that will sit on the throne of David for ever: has that promise been fulfilled? is not the nationality of Israel fading before your eyes? What are you to conclude from all this? Not, assuredly, that the promise has been false; but that your interpretation of it has been limited. Is it not clear to you by this time that Palestine was never meant to be your rest, that your promised rest is yet to come, that it awaits you, remaineth for you? Canaan was not the land flowing with milk and honey; you are only now reaching the borders of that promised country. The numerical population of outward Israel was not the multitudinous seed; the true seed is only about to be sown. The Messianic empire of

David was not the immutable and immovable kingdom; the kingdom which shall never be moved is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Such is a brief paraphrase of the main design of this Epistle. It aims to demonstrate that the permanent truth in Judaism was all along the latent and prospective Christianity which slumbered within it. The Writer expresses this truth in the very opening verses, where he contrasts the local character of Judaism with the permanent character of Christianity. The one was a revelation made "in times past;" the other was the centre of all revelations, past, present, and future: "Whom he hath appointed heir of all things, for whom also he made the ages." It will be seen that in using such language he is really assuming a conservative position. He is seeking to dissipate the notion that he is about to introduce an innovation. In all departments of human life there is a tendency to resist change; in no department is that tendency so strong as in the sphere of religion, and in no religious sphere was it so powerful as in Judaism. A worship which was based on the thought of Divine unity was at all times likely most strenuously to resist any effort at modification or transmutation. It was hence of the utmost importance that Christianity, in making its appearance to the world, should not make its appearance as a new or isolated thing. It was above all things desirable that the keynote of its manifestation should be this: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law." In displaying itself to the eye of Judaism, Christianity had to bring out of its treasure things old as well as new; and it was clearly its wisest policy to direct less attention to the new than to the old. The

Writer of this Epistle therefore has studied, amidst the contrasts of his comparison, to find a deeper bond of underlying agreement. Judaism, he says, was all along a local and temporary manifestation; yet there was in it from the beginning something which was older than itself, and which would outlast itself; that permanent element was the principle of Christianity. Christ was from the first the heir of all systems, the goal of Judaism and the flower of heathenism. The idea of the world existed for his sake: for Him God "made the ages." He was the climax of the world's plan. The climax of a plan comes last in order of time, but it is first in order of thought; the end of an author's work is that which is present to him at the beginning. Christ was the Alpha because He was the Omega: He was the first because He was the last. He was the latest and the ripest possible fruit which the tree of life could bear, and therefore He was the final cause of the tree of life's existence. The latest manifestation of the glory of humanity was the first idea which prompted the creation of humanity. That idea was present in Judaism, lay behind its forms and ceremonies, hid in its symbols, slept in its prophecies. The nation, while it seemed to be following its own way, was all the time being led by a way which it knew not. In the very act of pursuing its selfish Messianic policy, it was unconsciously being hurried on to the threshold of a golden age—the dispensation of the fulness of time; for the day of Christ God had made all its ages.

4. This brings us to the last point of comparison which the Writer of this Epistle presents between Christianity and Judaism. He tells us that the Jewish revelation did not come to our fathers from the foun-

tain-head, but only at second hand: God spoke to them "by the prophets." It will be seen that even the prophets themselves were in a not much better condition. They did not, any more than the people, receive a direct revelation; the communications came to them not in their natural aspect, but in "various modes" and in "divers parts." According to this Writer, then, the Jewish people were placed in the very unsatisfactory position of receiving, through a second party, a revelation which had only been made to that party by scattered hints and broken suggestions. The result was that in the worship of the people they felt themselves far removed from the Object of their worship. God was in the heavens; He was in his holy temple, in the secret of his pavilion, on the throne around which were clouds and darkness. It is to this element of distance that we must ascribe much of that tendency to idolatry which is so prevalent in the Jewish history. Men cannot worship a void any more than they can adore an abstraction. A God who is infinitely removed by distance is just as effectually separated from the soul as a God who is infinitely removed by nature. The God of Judaism was not an abstraction; He was essentially a personal Being: but his personality was that of the absolute monarch whose audience-chamber is closed to his people. The result was that between the Monarch and his people there had to be interposed an artificial bridge of communication. Heaven and earth being separated, a ladder had to be stretched between them on which the angels of God might ascend and descend. There sprang up in the Jewish world a system of angel-worship precisely analogous to that which subsequently sprang up

in the mediæval world, and for precisely the same reason—because the immediate Object of worship was too far removed to be accessible. It was on this principle of angelology that a body of men were selected to be the mediators of Divine Revelation. As the intervention of the angel represented God to man, so the intervention of the prophet represented man to God. Even the revelation of angels could not speak to humanity in the mass; it could only make itself known to the elect humanity—to those who by special gifts had been exalted above their fellows. The prophet was the immediate angel of the people, the lowest step of the ladder which descended from heaven to earth. In speaking to him the Jew spoke at least to a brother man; the defect of the communication lay in the fact that the prophet himself had not directly received the message. He was commissioned to deliver to the people what had come to him only in various modes and divers parts; and he himself was rarely, if ever, cognizant of the full import of these tidings which he bore. In a remarkable passage of the First Epistle of Peter it is distinctly set forth that the prophet was not a full recipient of his own message; that he had to search diligently as to the meaning of the words which he conveyed; and that the only part of the revelation which to him was personally clear was the fact of its being a revelation which could only be understood by posterity: "Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you."

Such, then, was the position of the Jewish nation with regard to the privilege of communion with God. It was at best a second-hand communion, conveyed to

the mass of mankind through a selected body of men. who themselves received the message only in fragments, and did not perfectly understand its import. It is here that the Writer to the Hebrews draws the final and the greatest contrast between Judaism and Christianity. He tells the Jewish world that for the first time it was about to pass into the immediate presence of God: that for the first time it was about to receive, not a message, but a revelation. He tells it that in Christianity it was to obtain a direct vision of that which had been hitherto only a distant report. The prophets were merely the organs through which the heavenly inspiration breathed; Christ was Himself the breath of inspiration. The prophets were merely the chords through which the heavenly music sounded; Christ was Himself the melody of heaven. The prophets were merely the servants; Christ was the Son. The prophets told the world about God; Christ's mission was the revelation of God. He came, not to bring a command from heaven, but to bring down the image of heaven. He brought to the world no light outside the circle of the Divine radiance; He was the brightness of the Father's glory. As the brightness of the sun is a part of the sun's essence, so, in the view of this Writer, the glory of the visible Christ was the outflowing of the brightness of God. He expresses the same thought when he says that. Christ was the express image of God's person; literally, the impression produced by the seal of his person. As the impression of the seal reveals the very nature of that which has stamped it, so has the character of the Son of man conveyed the very stamp of God. Judaism is asked to give up the part for the whole, to

surrender her imperfect record that she may receive a full explanation. The indirect is to be lost in the immediate; law is to be merged in love; and the words which have hitherto been committed to the prophet and to the angel are to come forth directly and spontaneously from the innermost heart of God.

GEORGE MATHESON.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. CHAPTER II.

Verse 1.—Thou therefore (oùv points back to the defection of others, contrasting it with what he is satisfied will prove the faithfulness of Timothy), my child (no break has occurred in the filial and paternal relation between these two), be endowed with strength, i.e., allow yourself to be strengthened, open your heart to the invigorating influences which may reach you, in the grace which is in Christ Fesus, in that heavenly succour, that aid of all kinds which flows from Christ Jesus as its Divine source. He is not only the highest type of Divine grace, but its fountain-head.

Verse 2.—And the things which thou heardest from me in the presence 2 of many witnesses:—Mack, Huther, Ellicott, refer this to the act of Timothy's ordination by St. Paul and by the presbyters.³ The aorist favours this interpretation. Still, if the Apostle was now looking back on his own ministry as a completed course,⁴ the aorist might be used to denote the whole testi-

^{* &#}x27;Ενδυναμοῦ is passive, not middle, if we may judge from the passive form, which cannot well be confounded with middle, in Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 20; Heb. xi. 34.

² This use of δια is rather unusual. See Winer and Ellicott's note.

³ I Tim. i. 18; iv. 14; vi. 12, 13; 2 Tim. i. 6.

⁴ Cf. iv. 7.

mony which St. Paul's life and word had borne to the facts and philosophy of Christianity. No countenance is given to the idea of esoteric doctrine or tradition, which some have deduced from it :- entrust thou to faithful men, such as will be fitted to teach others again. Aptness to teach, coupled with moral faithfulness, constitutes the genuine apostolic succession. Its function aims at no sacramental dignity, but consists of power and fitness to hand on by living word and holy loyalty, the Heaven-sent message of life. Divine truth has not been mended or enlarged by an apostolic tradition, in addition to, or distinct from, the apostolic writings; but it has been exemplified by holy living and persistent utterance of the ever open secret. No order of freemasonic privilege, or priestly assumption of exclusive rights, can be honestly introduced into this passage. Vigorous confirmation of this view arises in the Apostle's choice of illustrations which then follow.

Verse 3.—Do thou suffer affliction with me: I—Thus we find another hint of St. Paul's strong affection for Timothy, and his human craving for the younger man's sympathy in his present deep affliction. The muster-roll of apostolic men contains the sacred list of the martyrs and prisoners of Christ:—as a good soldier 2 of Christ Fesus. It is as if he said, "Encounter the difficulties, submit to the restraints, accept the terms, tests, risks, and regimen of a soldier. You and I are not our own. Our Commander-in-chief, our imperial Captain, our heavenly Country claim us as theirs. I do not place before you the honours of a

¹ The Textus Receptus here reads, $\sigma \dot{\nu}$ $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$, but Tischendorf (8), Meyer, Ellicott, read $\sigma \nu \gamma \kappa \alpha \kappa \sigma \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \nu$, with \aleph , A, C*, D*, and other MSS, and versions.

² Comp. for this genitive of possession, Eph. i. 1; Rom. i. 1.

general, but the toil and self-abnegation of the 'good soldier.' Some soldiers desert at the hour of peril, tamper with the enemy, and fear to die for their Master. Fulfil the ideal of a soldier by entire self-surrender, by faithfulness and heroism."

Verse 4.—No one on military service, I no one, i.e., who is taking the part of a soldier, cntangles himself in the businesses of life,-The soldier may, indeed, have his times of repose from active military service, when the ordinary avocations of life demand his attention; but while the campaign lasts, every other interest or claim is postponed or overborne - in order that he may please him who enrolled him in the army. The Spartan στρατός and the Roman exercitus consisted of all citizens who, when the object for which the army was organized had been attained, were forthwith disbanded. The illustration includes the idea of a rigidly guarded "order," to which Timothy and his elders belonged. The rank and file of the army rather than the dignity of officers and aristocrats furnish the Apostle with his most potent metaphor.

Verse 5.—Then, taking another illustration, he proceeds, Again, if any one also strive in the games ² (perform the part of an athlete in the public games of skill) he is not crowned if he do not strive lawfully, i.e., in harmony with the rules of training and conventional right provided in each case. Some of these laws are laid down by the master of the ceremonies, and others

 $[\]Sigma_{\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega}$ is one of a considerable group of verbs in $\epsilon\nu\omega$, which expresses in the middle voice the idea of acting the part, or fulfilling the functions, involved in the action of the verb.

 $^{^2}$ 'A $\theta\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$ is more frequently used in this sense, while $\dot{a}\theta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, the word used here, is confined in Attic Greek to sense of endurance and labour; but Rost and Palm give instances among later Greek writers of this use.

by the physician. The spiritual athlete must attend to all the laws of evangelical conflict. He cannot dispense with self-sacrificing toil. He must be content to undergo long preparation. He should appreciate the difficulty of the strife and the claims of his antagonist. No unfair advantage should be taken of an enemy, be he sinner, idolater, or unbeliever. If the spiritual athlete would win the crown of successful strife with competitors for the same honour, his training and his conduct of the strife must be in harmony with the laws of truth and uprightness. The worse reason is not rhetorically to be made the better, nor must the rotten argument be thought good enough for the fool or the child.

Verse 6.—It is due to the husbandman who is labouring (unto weariness) to partake first of all the fruits. The most willing and devoted labourer is the most speedily blessed. Another illustration of ministerial office is now drawn from the handwork of the husbandman. Should the minister of God want the honours of a commander, the ensigns of bravery, the crown of successful conflict, or speedy participation in the fruits of toil, he must acquire the genius of thoroughness, conscientiousness, zeal, self-forgetfulness, enthusiasm. After hinting this, St. Paul, as though he thought he had been speaking in parables which needed interpretation, adds, Understand (intellectually grasp) the thing which I am saying (under these metaphors), for the Lord will give thee accurate comprehension in all

¹ Winer is said to have found transgression of syntax in the reference of the $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\sigma\nu$ to the $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu$, and to have referred it to $\kappa\sigma\pi\iota\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha$; but (p. 696) he states with great respect the translation given above.

² Δώσει is preferred on good authority (κ, A, C, D, F, &c.) to δψή.

³ Notiv is to apprehend, to perceive the details of; συνίεναι, to put together the elements of which knowledge is built up.

things. "To him that hath shall be given." "Seek and thou shalt find." The understanding of one parable is often a key to the apprehension of other dark sayings upon the harp.

Verse 8.—Remember Fesus Christ, bear Him in remembrance as one who (has been and) is raised from the dead, of the seed of David according to my gospel. has been said that this is a clumsy quotation from Romans i. 3 by the unknown author of the Epistle. There is no need to make this supposition if another reason can be found for a reference to the earthly birth and Messianic dignity of the risen Christ. Do we not find it in the fact that if Timothy makes a conscience of cherishing this sublime synthesis, this blending of the Divine and human, this linking of the spiritual kingdom with the age-long preparation for it, this union of the seed of David with the unseen and spiritual world, then the young apostle will cast his anchor within the veil and hold fast to the cable, and he will be the brave, humble, honourable, and patient man that St. Paul desires him to be? "My gospel" need not be Luke's gospel, as Jerome in the old time, and recently Baur affirmed; but the glad tidings which it had been St. Paul's privilege to utter, and with which he was entrusted. In proclaiming which I suffer evil as a malefactor, even up to chains. Am I not now suffering cruel imprisonment, Roman citizen that I am, riveted to a common soldier as though I were a traitor or a desperado? This term shews how different St. Paul's position was during the second imprisonment from what it had been during the first. In consequence of Nero's change of policy, the charge brought against him now

is more serious and perilous, though it is but another testimony to his unconquerable faith:—but the word of God has not been chained, nor is it now. St. Paul, who had begotten Onesimus in his former bonds, and had diffused the truth throughout the prætorium and in other places, exults still. He knows that God's truth is too subtle for human malice to arrest its progress or confine its spirit.

Verse 10.—For this cause I endure all things for the elect's sake. It is open to question whether the διὰ τοῦτο followed by ἴνα does not require us to look in the subsequent clause for the reason of his patient endurance. The Vulgate rendered διὰ τοῦτο by ideo, and Luther by darum. Bengel says, quia me vincto evangelium currit, and with him Luther agrees; yet there are other illustrations of a similar usage 1 which bid us look further afield for the ground of St. Paul's patient endurance of all things. The endurance (ὑπομένω) is submission to the Divine will, spontaneous acceptance of the position, not a dogged despairing recognition of the inevitable, but a loving harmony of the whole man with the Divine appointment. We have elsewhere see that ὑπομονὴ is the child of hope, not of despair. Now comes St. Paul's sublime and noble hope, In order that they also (with him) may obtain salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. The question, doubtless, arises, does St. Paul here, and also in Colossians i. 24, regard his own afflictions as a part of the redemptive suffering by which the elect should receive the gift of Christ's salvation and inherit their eternal glory. This would undoubtedly contradict the whole tenour of his teaching elsewhere.

¹ Cf. 1 Tim. i. 15; Phil. 15.

"Was Paul crucified for you?" rings out (in 1 Cor. i. 13) his own indignant disclaimer of any such position. Still he does assert his hope and conviction that direct and positive advantages may accrue to the elect of God from his own sufferings.

The "salvation" is "in Christ Jesus," still there are (ὑστερήματα) "things lacking" in the (θλίψεις) afflictions of the Lord which he and other saints are called upon to supplement (ἀνταναπληροῦν), to fill up from another source. They are to be filled up in the persons of the members of Christ's suffering body. Because these bitter sorrows effectuate or tend to produce a closer resemblance to Christ, because they may lead to a more intense consecration on the part of the elect of God, he willingly endures them all. We take it that these θλίψεις of Christ are not his atoning or sacrificial agonies, but all the contumely and repression which He endured for us and with us, and also which He, in sublime sympathy, continues to suffer in his body the Church, and which will not be completed until the last battle has been fought and the last enemy overcome. Thus the Lord dignifies every patiently borne cross, every holy death, as part of his own affliction for the sake of the elect.

Some Protestant theologians have eviscerated these words of their true meaning, in order to escape the conclusion which Romanists have drawn from them. Moreover, other critics have endeavoured to establish by their aid the identity in kind of the sufferings of Christ and of his saints, and to proclaim the atoning value of all suffering; but we desire to take the words as they stand, neither justifying the Romanist doctrine of the supererogatory merit of saints, nor contradic-

ting the Pauline doctrine of redemption. Nevertheless, we distinctly recognize the fact that Paul's patient suffering was part of the process by which the elect of all time will be called into the fellowship of the sufferings and of the life of Christ. The same idea reappears in 2 Corinthians i. 5, 6, where similar phraseology occurs—"Because as the sufferings of Christ abound unto us, so our comfort also abounds through Christ. And whether we are afflicted $(\theta \lambda \iota \beta \delta \mu \epsilon \theta a)$, it is for your comfort and salvation $(\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \iota as)$; and whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which is effective in the patient endurance $(\epsilon \nu \nu \sigma \rho \mu \sigma \nu \eta)$ of the same sufferings $(\pi a \theta \eta \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu)$ which we also suffer.

Verse II. — Faithful is the saying. Here, then, emerges another of the prophetic utterances of the early Church, which has passed into current use. The use in this instance may have been found in the service of song. It seems to me that the $\gamma \lambda \rho$ has all its necessary force, if it is supposed to introduce a strophe of the then well-known triplet, "for"—as you sing 2 and know to be true,—

If we died with (Him), we shall also live with Him;
If we endure with (Him), we shall reign with (Him);
If we shall deny (Him), He also will deny us;
If we disbelieve, He abideth faithful, for He cannot deny
Himself.

"We (said or sang the ancient Church) were crucified with Him, buried with Him at our baptism; our faith in the crucified ONE slew us, it destroyed the old

Tischendorf Text, eighth edition.

 $^{^{\}circ}$ Mack has ingeniously arranged the words in parallelistic form, each line commencing with ϵl_{*}

man, annihilated the supremacy of the law as the ground of our justification. Our faith was a death with Christ, a process of cruel dying to sin, a burial from the sight and fascination of the world; and it was also a resurrection,"

In one act of faith, the old man died, the new man lived. The future tense is used to express this resurrection-life, and we admit that it points onward to a complete fulfilment in our ultimate resurrection from the deathlike life of our mundane existence. The present tense is used in the next clause. The ὑπομόνη is a continuous process, which in our present resurrection-life brings us into communion with the suffering life of the Son of God. In like manner 1 St. Paul elsewhere adopts the same somewhat puzzling order of spiritual experiences. He would know the power of Christ's resurrection, then fellowship in his sufferings, and after all this, conformableness to his death.

Further, the early Church commemorated in their hymn the awful peril of treachery to the Lord, remembering his own words, "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father." There are many ways of denying Christ, both by word and action. We may take the part of his enemies, or ignore his supreme claim to our allegiance; we may transform Him into a myth, a fairy tale, a subjective principle, or find a substitute in our own life for his grace; and we may assume that He is not the ground of our reconciliation, nor the Giver of salvation, nor the sole Head of his Church. If so, we may reasonably fear, lest He should refuse to acknowledge us when upon his approval our eternal destiny will turn.

This faithful saying concludes in still sterner tone, and utters a sublime challenge to the apostate. "If we disbelieve," holding to no reality, estranging ourselves from the life-giving force of faith, relinquishing the truth about Him, this will make no difference whatsoever as to the reality of the Christ, or the certainty of his inviolable word. "He cannot deny himself." What He was, He is. The *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of literature, the parliaments of nations, the councils of Churches, nay, the federation of a world, cannot in the faintest respect alter his nature. He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

Verse 14. — These things, thus enumerated as a faithful saying, recall, my son Timothy, to (their) minds, I solemnly enjoining them before the Lord not to wrangle2 about words:-This "logomachy" referred to 3 is a continuous temptation of the Church. Men have substituted "words" for "things," and then stipulated for the words to the disparagement of the things or the ideas expressed by them. So long as "words" connote things of importance, it is just and wise to contend for them. For "death and life may then be in the power of the tongue;" but as soon as words cease to convey their own proper meaning to those who use them, or become mere battle-cries or watchwords, and are made the occasion of conflict between those who are actually meaning the same thing by different words, or different things by the same word, logomachy becomes the curse of the Church. When parties either stickle for, or loudly condemn, forms or phrases,

¹ Cf. Titus iii. 1; John xiv. 26.

² That λογομαχεῖν is infinitive, and not imperative, is now accepted by most critics. This justifies the general use of New Testament as to the construction of the verb διαμαρτυρόμενος.

3 I Tim. vi. 20.

rites or formulæ, without intelligence, under the mere force of tradition or the sway of association, an amount of insincerity is engendered which threatens the life of men. This logomachy is a course or thing profitable for nothing, and what is worse, leading to the ruin of those that hear the windy conflict. Many can swear by a shibboleth or an orthodox phrase, or draw their sword to fight for it, without apprehending its meaning. Let the golden rule of St. Paul be remembered, "In Christ Jesus there is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, but faith working by love."

Verse 13. - Give diligence to present 2 thyself to God approved, i.e., as one who has passed the (δοκιμασία) test of trial and sorrow and received the Divine approval, an unshamed 3 workman, who has no occasion to blush, rightly dividing the word of the truth. Many attempts have been made to interpret this word "rightly dividing." Beza referred it to the process of dividing the sacrifice according to rule; Calvin, the rightful dividing of the bread of a household. Theodoret supposed that the action of the labourer in cutting straight furrows in the field suggested the image. These interpretations have given place to the idea of accurate or straight cutting of a road.4 In favour of this. Proverbs iii. 6, ΐνα ὀρθοτομŷ τὰς ὀδούς σου—"that she may make straight (rightly direct) thy ways "-is often cuoted. But since καινοτομείν means to endeavour new things, rather than "cut out new ways," it may be possible that the etymology sinks out of view in the

 $^{^{\}text{\tiny I}}$ Χρήσιμον is ἀπ. λεγ. in New Testament.

² Ellicott defends the simple meaning of παραστήσαι. exhibere Deo, Vulg.; erzeigen, Luther.

³ The classical usage of ἀνεπαίσχυντος is "shameless;" it is ἀπ. λεγ. in New Testament.
4 See Palm and Rost.

usage. The Syriac Version translated it, "rightly proclaiming the word of truth." This view has been practically accepted by Deyling, Huther, Alford, Fairbairn, and this is far better than forcing a doubtful etymology into the text. St. Paul summons Timothy to a right straightforward method of dealing with the Divine word. He would have him set out clear lines for the intellect, a plain path for the feet, a just appeal to the emotions, a true stimulant of the conscience. Let Timothy, and let all his successors, aim to set forth God's truth in such a way before the understanding that honest assent may be rational and life-giving. This expression is the knell of party politics, the protest against all dishonest interpretations of Scripture, all illusive teaching, all drawing forth from God's word what we have first put into it, and all that morbid exaggeration of half-truths, or of one side only of a Divine revelation, which makes the truth of God into a lie. Some have so preached the unity of God, that they have lost those distinctions in his ineffable substance on which his moral nature really turns and rests. Some have laid such emphasis on the distinctions in his essence that they have practically introduced polytheism into the centre of Divine revelation. Some have laid such emphasis on the Divine righteousness, that they have ceased to believe in God's love. And so on, through the whole range of Christian revelation. Occasionally a side view, a possible truth, an accessory revelation. has been lifted into prime importance, and allowed to hide from view the primal and essential verities. Thus, the double resurrection, the premillenial advent, the

¹ Observ. Sacræ., vol. iv.

present fortunes of the lost tribes, certain methods of Church government, or of Church action, the shape of a vesture, or the mode of conducting an ordinance, have been made essential to Church-fellowship, or regarded as indispensable tests of Christian experience. Against all this St. Paul warns Timothy.

Verses 16, 17.—But stand off with loathing from the profanci babblings, the worthless empty voices, of the false teachers, which elsewhere 2 the writer has identified with the chatter and fiction of imbecile old women, and with the cumbrous antitheses of falsely called science (gnosis); for they (not exactly the voices, but the men who utter them3) will advance 4 to more of ungodliness. The tendency of this vain, frivolous talk is away from God; and their word will consume, will eat up, like a gangrene. The phrase is remarkable (νομὴν έξει): "Their word will obtain pasture, like a gangrene or cancer." Νομή is the medical word used for the action of a mortifying disease; and we might suppose from the etymology that the ancient physicians had some hint of the germ theory of certain diseases. "Unless," says Hippocrates, "a person is rapidly by sharp processes healed of gangrene, the suffering portion will readily perish: it will lay hold of the surrounding parts, and kill the man." This is very unlike the worldly temporizing involved in the advice given by Gamaliel to the Sanhedrin, words which are often made to do service for God's truth. The growth

^{*} $B \in \Im \eta \lambda o c$, that which pertains to $\beta \dot{\eta} \lambda o c$, or the threshold rather than the interior of home or temple; hence common, unconsecrated, profane.

² Cf. Titus iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 7 and vi. 20.

³ This is evident from the next Verse, "their word" (ὁ λόγος ἀντῶν).

⁴ Προκόπτω, Galatians i. 14; also chap. iii. 9, 13. Used in classics for cu ting down trees for the advance of an army.

of certain low forms of life at the expense of the higher organism is seen, not only in zymotic diseases, in blight, intrusive insect or vegetable growth, but in the rapidity with which a vile passion will sometimes grow in a community, consuming its higher life, and degrading it past recognition. Of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus. We know nothing of these men. Hymenæus be identified with a person of the same name, whom the Apostle excommunicated from the Church (1 Tim. i. 20), the effect of that "delivery to Satan" by apostolic judgment had not been salutary. If the Alexander also mentioned (l.c.) were a follower of the views of Hymenæus on the earlier occasion, he has now yet another disciple, and his influence and spirit are worse than ever. Timothy is advised to adopt a policy of isolation. This view is quite as "rational" and "scientific" as to argue that the epistle before us was the first letter to Timothy, penned either by the Apostle (Schleiermacher) or by a falsarius (the Tübingen school), and that the composer of the First Epistle (written afterwards) blundered over the name, giving by mistake a later rather than an earlier stage of the history of this imaginary personage. Church censure and exclusion often drive the subject of it into more thorough antagonism alike to the truth and to the Church. Who as concerning the truth missed their aim (they were in the right line, but have "turned aside," gone out of their way), saying that the resurrection has already taken place; and they overthrow the faith of some. Numerous speculations have been indulged in as to the precise significance of the doctrinal error of Hymenæus.

¹ See note on chap. iv. 14.

Thus some have supposed that he taught that the ανάστασις took place at the death of Christ; but this would have been true so far as it goes: 1 others that it referred to the resurrection of the Jewish nationality, and therefore had already taken place. This view, however, would have been a half-truth, and one, moreover, which these Ephesian Gnostics would be very unlikely to have espoused. Probably they confined the idea of the avaoraous to a spiritual emergence from the death of sin to a new life. They had exaggerated certain Pauline teachings, forgetting that St. Paul taught a full "redemption of the body" at the coming of Christ. The resurrection of the body was indeed assailed by Dualistic and Gnostic views touching the incurable evil of "matter" and of "the body." Tertullian shews that Marcion went to this extreme, desiring nothing better for the body than its final annihilation. But Christianity turns on the rectification and sanctification of the body, on the certainty of a holy, perfect, and eternal communion with God in and through the work of his hands. Christianity promises a spiritual body to the redeemed man, and encourages him to hope that he will be "clothed upon with a house from heaven." It does not teach us to expect or desire a naked unembodied state, but a heavenly tabernacle, an enduring temple, a body resembling that of the glorified Lord. Of this consummation the resurrection of Christ is the significant type, the assurance to all men, the condition and occasion, just as He Himself is the causal agency by which this glorious change will be wrought.

Verse 19 .- Nevertheless (we should give full force

to the μέντοι. If the spirit of the Apostle was perturbed with vain babblings, or cruel mortification, or the spread of plausible or perilous theories, he required to fall back upon great and deep principles), the firm foundation of God standeth—the foundation laid in Zion, with its glorious corner-stone, the foundation of the spiritual temple, of the Church of all elect souls, standeth—seeing that it has this seal, this divine impression or inscription upon it.2 The solemn inscription is twofold in its bearing. The terms of it are taken from the narrative in Numbers xvi. 5.3 The Lord knoweth 4 those that are his (own). "I know," said Christ, "my sheep, and am known of mine." The Lord's eye rests on "his own," though they may be misapprehended or excommunicated by men, or even be fraternizing with those who vainly claim a position to which, in his sight, they can prefer no title. This foundation-stone bears another inscription of a practical kind, drawn probably from the same narrative. In the evolution of the fearful drama of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, the command went forth, "Separate yourselves from the tents of these wicked men." 5 This was in the Apostle's memory when he proceeded, and let every one who nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity or unrighteousness. God's thought and purpose concerning them are not infallibly communicated to those who are nevertheless "known of Him." Neither inward monitions, nor ecclesiastical absolution, nor assurance of hope, will meet the whole case; and

² Cf. Rev. xxi. 14.

¹ "It unites both confirmation ($\mu \epsilon \nu$) and restriction ($\tau o i$), and involves an opposition to the preceding clause, and meets a possible objection."—Ellicott.

³ The only deviation is that $\kappa i \rho \iota \rho \sigma_{\zeta}$ takes the place of $\theta \epsilon \delta c_{\zeta}$ in LXX. St. Paul, in this respect, makes a closer approach to the Hebrew.

⁴ The Hebrew "", may be Hiphil, and mean "cause to know," or "show," or it may be present participle, Kal, and mean "know." 5 Numb. xvi. 26.

these supposed guarantees of a supernatural fact will fail utterly should those who fancy themselves to be God's own people not depart from unrighteousness. Here at least the stringent test applies. The secret dealings of infinite Love and Knowledge do not dispense with spontaneous obedience and moral purity. Admit the heavenly calling, but recognize the imperative demand involved in it for a departure—sudden, sweeping, heart-rending, it may be—from all iniquity. This blending of Divine grace with human responsibility discloses a grand hall-mark of New Testament theology.

Verse 20.—But in a great house, in the erection reared upon this foundation, in all the sacred and new associations which spring up in the household of faith, in the new life of family and of society thus created, in all the blessed fellowship sometimes called the "visible Church," amid the numerous relations which have thus been powerfully affected by the regeneration of those who are united to Christ-in a great house there are not only golden and silver vessels, but also wooden and earthen vessels—vessels, i.e., of very different value, but all of some value—precious faculties, great powers, some beautiful in themselves, others devoted to sacred uses; some used on state occasions, others consigned to humble and daily, but less conspicuous, less honourable, service. The wooden bowl or earthen cup may vet be of greater use than the silver chalice or the golden goblet. Moreover, in a great house some of its most costly treasures may be delicately carved wood, or exquisitely shaped pottery:—and there are some vessels destined to honour and some to dishonour. These phrases are not, as is commonly supposed, co-extensive with the two classes of vessels previously enumerated. It would be contrary to the spirit of the New Testament and wrong to suppose the "gold and silver vessels" were those reserved for honour, while the wood and porcelain vessels alone were irrevocably destined to dishonour. The Master Himself might prefer the earthen vessel for some of his highest ends, and into it He might pour the most fragrant and sacred essences of his love. The gold and silver of the great house might be associated in the past with licentiousness and idolatry, while temperance, utility, life-giving service might be associated with the work of the potter. ^I Consequently, the ἀπὸ τούτων of Verse 21 does not surely refer to the vessels of wood and earth which are devoted to less honourable or to mean uses. Some stronger word would have been used if the Apostle was comparing them with "profane babblings," or the "gangrene" of the earlier verses. Surely he refers to these very evil things. For a moment he drops the figure of the house and the foundation, to take it up again in the remaining portion of the sentence. Purification from vessels would be a very incongruous figure. What St. Paul says is-

Verse 21.—If therefore any man shall have purged himself from these evil associations or corrupting ideas, from persons whose words are like the deadly poison of a contagious gangrene, then he will be a vessel unto honour, whether his faculties cause him to resemble the golden goblet or the silver lamp, the wooden bowl or the porcelain vase; if pure and conscientious, faithful and good, he will be consecrated to noblest uses, serviceable to the Master of the house, and prepared for every good work. The advice may strike some as prudish and narrow-minded. But it amounts to this, "Avoid the crotchety, the frivolous, the profane; give a wide

¹ See particularly Rom. ix. 21.

berth to the chatterers, the conceited, the babblers, who can with light heart dispense with most sacred truth, and bid you sacrifice everything most dear to you on the altar of their intellectual whim. Take care of your company, your friendship, your habits." This explains perhaps, the startling Verse which follows.

Verse 22.—Morever, flee the passions of youth. Timothy was no longer a young man, but he was still in the strength of his manhood, when he might easily suffer from desires and passions which are comparatively venial in a youth. Flee juvenilia desideria, the immoderate hilarity, the irregular longings of the flesh and mind, the rashness of judgment, the self-indulgence, the love of admiration, which are the weakness and failure of youth, not its beauty nor its charm: and pursue righteousness, right relations with God, those which arise out of a free acceptance of Divine mercy. Pursue faith, which is the human condition of this "righteousness," and love, which is its moral and spiritual result. "Love" connotes the new life of the spirit, the selfabnegation which springs from the force of a new affection—love to God and love to man. And, lastly, "follow after peace with all who call on the Lord out of a pure heart.² The advice is not a mere complimentary association of Timothy's mind in these exercises with all who call on the name of the Lord (Heydenreich), but an indication of the breadth and applicability of Christian charity.3 "Seek after peace with all who are calling upon the name of the Lord." This is to be set over against the abstention demanded from profane

The second seco

word-mongering and mere lip-service. Elsewhere the Apostle suggests that it requires an *effort* to live peaceably with all men, though some may be godly and good.

Verse 23.—But on the other hand avoid the foolish and ill-considered, ignorant, irrelevant discussions. Almost all the synonyms of ἀπαίδευτος are more appropriately applied to persons than to questions. There are irrelevant, ignorant questions that any fool can ask, which shew how little the grave questions affecting the faith of Christ have ever entered into the breast of the questioner. It would be easy to enumerate a long string of the questions which have done duty for the quibbler from the days of Celsus to Tom Paine, and others which have harassed and discomposed the tempers of Christian people generation after generation:—knowing, as thou dost² (Ellicott), that they may engender strifes, fights, conflicts.

Verse 24.—But (the) servant of the Lord must not strive, or fight. Let Titus i. 1 and James i. 1 be compared for this use of the great term "the servant, or slave, of the Lord," one who occupies a high position among Christian labourers, workers, soldiers, or husbandmen. There is an obvious reason why he should not strive nor cry nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. He must be the peacemaker, and be conciliatory. Let him avoid the very topics which have no other issue than to reveal irreconcilable differences about trifles. He must be gentle, 3 patient, silver-

¹ 'Aπαίδευτος is an $\dot{\alpha}\pi$. λεγ. in the New Testament, though it often occurs in the LXX. of the Old Testament, and as the translation of words meaning folly and ignorance. In the Apocrypha it means stupid, impious. A scholiast on Aristophanes makes it equivalent to $\dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ and $\dot{\nu}\omega\delta\eta\varsigma$.—Schleusner in V.T., s.v.

² "Denn du weissest" (Luther), "Da oder weil du weisst" (Huther). The participle in an imperative sentence conveys the ground of the injunction.

³ The word $\eta \pi u \sigma_0$ is found here, and in Tischendorf's reading, I Thess. ii. 7, for $\nu \eta \pi u \sigma_0$. Its primary meaning is "healing by the voice, by incantation;" it is translated (Vulgate) by mansuetum esse.

tongued towards all men. St. Paul never said a harder thing, or indicated a more difficult duty. Apt in teaching; i.e., at once ready and able to teach. Some are ready, even eager, who are not able; and many are able who are not willing or ready to teach. This characteristic differs profoundly from the possession of prophetic fire, and it cannot be restricted to the pedagogic insistence on elementary truths, but suggests a mental and moral fitness for imparting and impressing truth. Patient of wrong. In illustrating these words, most Commentators refer to the celebrated passage in Wisdom ii. 19, where the writer puts into the lips of the wilful enemies of the good man the words, "With insolence and torture let us put him to the test, that we may know his (ἐπιείκεια) 'sweet reasonableness,' and put to the proof his ἀνεξικακία, his patient endurance of wrong." Endurance of malicious detraction is one of the victories of grace.

Verse 25.—In meckness correcting those that put themselves in opposition, if perchance God may give them repentance to the full acknowledgment of the truth. The phrase is difficult as it stands. Strictly translated, it would be, "lest at any time;" but this would be out of harmony with the whole strain of the passage. Grave doubt is expressed, but hope is not extinguished. God is the giver of repentance. Scherlitz, quoted by Fairbairn, suggests, "whether God may not still give repentance." Here is expression of the thought that there is room and necessity for the operation of the Spirit of God, over and above the normal action of the truth upon the understanding.

 $^{^{}x}$ Μή ποτε διήη. Winer, p. 631. The dubitative μ ή, coupled with ποτε, in the sense of indefinite time. Dr. Moulton gives it "whether haply." Green (Gk. Gram.), "The Apostle set out with the dubitative force of μ ή, but subjoined a mood corresponding with the prevailing thought, which certainly involves hope, not despair."

Verse 26.—And that they may return to sobriety from the benumbing intoxication of false philosophy and bad habits, here represented as a snare of the devil, in which, though held captive, they were not yet killed: -out of the snare of the devil, being made living I captives of by him. So far there is no difficulty, but the last clause, according to the will of Him (ὑπ' αὐτου εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα), leaves the reader in doubt as to its meaning, since two pronouns are used which generally, if not universally, refer to two different subjects. De Wette, Huther, and Davidson disregard² the difference of the pronouns, and make them both refer to the devil. But the contrast of the two pronouns is remarkable, and the sense of the passage very obscure, the "will of the devil" being an otiose addition, unless it be translated, as by Davidson, "to do his will." If ekelvov refers to the more remote antecedent, then "God's will" is suggested as the gracious accompaniment and occasion of this gift of repentance, or as the exposition of the state of new life, into which such penitents may be brought. The passage will read as follows: Whether haply God would grant them repentance, and also whether haply they may return to sobriety, into (harmony with) his will, out of the snare of the devil, seeing they have been made living captives by him.3

This view of the evil in the world, and of the peril assailing the Asiatic Churches, betrays the melancholy outlook which the Apostle at that moment entertained. Nor is this tone of mind peculiar to the Pastoral

¹ Ζωγρειν has the same sense in Luke v. 10.

 $^{^2}$ A passage is quoted from Plato's *Cratylus*, which is said to involve the same usage : $\Delta \epsilon \tilde{\imath} \xi a \iota a \dot{v} \tau \tilde{\psi} \tilde{a} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \dot{v} \chi \eta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu o \iota \epsilon \dot{\kappa} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma a$.

³ This principle of translation is adopted by Grotius and Ellicott. Others have referred the αὐτοῦ to the "Servant of the Lord," and the ἐκείνου to God; and it is by no means certain that this is not the meaning of the passage. Ellicott thinks that this suggestion "does not seem to require notice."

Epistles. We find the same anticipations overshadowing his earliest letters, those to the Thessalonians. In his Epistle to the Galatians he gave a sad list of the works of the flesh. In Philippians iii. 18–22 he saw the ways and the doom of the enemies of the cross of Christ. As he drew near his end, he prophesied the apparent triumph of evil, and we need not be surprised to find here in these last words a weird and sombre prevision of the hard and perilous times which would accompany the development and consummation of Messiah's kingdom.

H. R. REYNOLDS.

ECCLESIASTES.

CHAPTER II. VERSES 4-II.I

HENGSTENDERG has remarked that the first two Verses of this Chapter form the germ of the Parable of the Rich Fool in Luke xii. 16–21. As here the soul is addressed, "delight thyself in pleasure" (look upon good), so there, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθά: as here, "I will prove thee with joy;" so there, εῦφραίνου: as here, "it is mad," so there, ἄφρων; Verse 12 and Verse 19 here having also their counterpart in the ἃ δὲ ἡτοίμασας τίνι ἔσται there.

The parallel, indeed, applies, so far as it applies at all, to the whole of this section, and not merely to the first two Verses; but the future here is very different from the future of the parable. The sense of the "folly" here is awakened by the unsatisfying nature of earthly enjoyment; the "folly" there is only seen in the light of death and the judgment.

The passage that follows is, as Reuss has remarked, one of the most picturesque in the Book. It is Solo-

The translation of these Verses will be found in the September number of The Expositor.

mon's history sketched in bold outline. It is the tale of an Eastern despot, surrounding himself with all that absolute will and immense resources could command. The experiment is no longer the indulgence in sensual pleasures, though these were not wanting (Verse 8): it is the attempt to find satisfaction in vast undertakings, which furnished ample and constant occupation to a mind naturally active. Pleasure has palled upon him; he will occupy himself with schemes worthy of a monarch.

Verse 4.—I engaged in great works (literally, "I made great my works "-conceived and executed them on a grand scale). I builded me houses: one magnificent palace after another; his own palace, which was thirteen years in building; the palace of the forest of Lebanon, with its pillars, forty-five in number, fifteen in a row, and the hall of judgment for the throne; and the palace he built for Pharaoh's daughter (1 Kings vii. 1-12); all of these rich in adornment of cedar and gold and ivory, and sumptuously embellished with the rare and costly work of Tyrian and other artists, whom Solomon had assembled at his court. His gardens and vineyards were not less famous than his palaces. Every page of Solomon's Song bears witness to his intense delight in nature, to his love of trees and flowers, to his keen appreciation of all their richness and variety of colour and perfume, and of the delicious freshness and luxuriant verdure of the forest solitudes of North Palestine; and we know that "he spake of all trees and plants, from the cedar which groweth in Lebanon to the hyssop that springeth out of the wall." David had his vineyards, that formed part of the royal domain, and whence came the wine for the royal cellars (1 Chron. xxvii. 27); but Solomon planted

more; and he laid out spacious gardens and parks, or pleasaunces; and he stocked his orchards with every variety of fruit-tree, and he spared no pains upon their cultivation. With this end he constructed tanks and reservoirs, and had an elaborate system of irrigation, which was necessary in a country like Palestine, to ensure the growth and fertility of trees, many of which were doubtless imported from other countries. Thus the forest or the park was "luxuriant with trees," and the trees planted by the channels of waters gave their fruit in their season, and their leaf did not wither—an apt and striking emblem of the godly man's life, which seems to have impressed itself upon Solomon's mind, and to have suggested the image in the First Psalm, a Psalm which, as I have shewn elsewhere, there is good reason for believing was written by Solomon.2

One such pleasaunce as this there was at Etam, Solomon's Belvedere, as Josephus 3 informs us. Thither it was the custom of the king, he says, to resort when he made his morning excursions from the city, clad in a white garment, and driving his chariot, surrounded by his body-guard of young men in the flower of their age, clad in Tyrian purple, and with gold-dust strewed upon their hair, so that their whole head sparkled when the sun shone upon it, and mounted upon horses from the royal stables, famed for their beauty and fleetness. "These morning excursions were usually to a certain place called Etam, about sixty stadia from Jerusalem.

The word pardés, or "paradise," is evidently of foreign, probably of Persian, extraction, and only occurs twice beside in the Old Testament: in the Song of Solomon, iv. 13, where the Authorized Version renders it "orchard," an "orchard of pomegranates;" and in Nehemia 1 ii. 8, where the Authorized Version has "forest." In both places, as here, the LXX. give παραδεῖσος as the equivalent; the Vulgate has paradisus, except in Nehemiah, where it has silva.

² I have given the reasons for this belief in my Commentary on that Psalm.

³ Antiq. viii. 7, 3.

Gardens and brooks made it as pleasant as it was fruitful." A watercourse from this place, the ruins of which are still visible, supplied the Temple with water. At the upper end of the winding valley, at a considerable height above the bottom, are three old Solomonic pools—large oblong basins of considerable compass, placed one behind the other in terraces. Almost at an equal height with the highest pool, at a distance of several hundred steps, there is a fountain, which is carefully built over; thence the pools were fed, the water being carried into the upper pool by a subterranean conduit.

To maintain all this state a large retinue of servants was necessary. Accordingly he tells us that he had slaves, male and female, purchased with his money (mancipiæ), and slaves born in his house (vernæ—Gen. xiv. 14; xv. 2; Jer. ii. 14. See I Kings iv. 26, 27; ix. 20, 21; 2 Chron. ix. 25); moreover, he had herds of cattle and flocks of sheep and goats, such as were never possessed by any king in Jerusalem before. Solomon's vast herds are mentioned I Kings iv. 23; viii. 63; I Chron. xxvii. 29, as are those of his father David. He amassed silver and gold, as we read in the history of Solomon, "Silver and gold at Jerusalem were as plenteous as stones" (I Kings x. 27; cf. 2 Chron. i. 15; ix. 27).

And the peculiar treasure of kings and the provinces. The expression presents some difficulty. The word translated "peculiar treasure," in all the other passages where it occurs, except in I Chronicles xxix. 3, is applied to the people of Israel, who are spoken of as the "peculiar treasure" of God. In that passage, where the Authorized Version renders "mine own proper good," David is speaking of money, gold and

silver, which he had contributed out of his own privy purse in preparing for the building of the Temple. "I have a treasure of mine own," he says, "gold and silver." The word is used here in a similar sense. It has been explained, though I think wrongly, of the peculiar products of different countries, which were either sent as gifts or paid as tribute to Solomon. If we adhere to the strict meaning of the Hebrew word, we can only understand it either (1) of the treasures accumulated by kings and by the provinces, or (2) Solomon's own treasure, his privy purse, as derived from the gifts of kings and the provinces. Jerome seems to understand it, and I think rightly, in the latter sense, for he explains: "Sed et thesauri argenti et auri innumerabiles condebantur, quos mihi diversorum regum munera et gentium tributa contribuerant." The "kings" are not only vanquished monarchs, such as those mentioned in I Kings iv. 21, where we are told that Solomon reigned over all kings, from the river to the borders of Egypt, and that they brought gifts and served him all the days of his life; but monarchs like Hiram of Tyre, or like the Oueen of Sheba, who gave gifts in token of amity.

The word "kings" is without the article; the word "provinces" is with the article. The former, therefore, is general; the latter is restricted: some particular provinces are meant. The word translated "province" means properly *jurisdiction*. It occurs only in the later Books of the Bible, and is chiefly applied to the Persian provinces or satrapies; and hence the Israelites dwell-

¹ Professor Tayler Lewis, to evade the force of this fact as an argument for the later date of Ecclesiastes, remarks that the word is regularly formed from the old Hebrew root (din), and argues that therefore it might have been used in 1 Kings iv. 7 to describe the provinces into which Solomon parcelled out his kingdom. The fact remains that it is not used there.

ing in a district in Persia are called "the sons of the province." Here, as the reference is to the reign of Solomon, we naturally look to the history for an explanation of the term; and we find that, according to I Kings iv. 7, &c., Solomon divided his kingdom into twelve districts, each having an officer over it "which provided victuals for the king and his household: each man his month in a year made provision." The general sense, then, seems to be that Solomon's privy purse was maintained by the contributions, free or enforced, of foreign monarchs and of his own subjects.

This vast wealth, this more than Oriental magnificence, had also its Oriental luxuriousness, and its ministries of voluptuous gratification. I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, concubines of all sorts. The men singers and women singers were intended to enliven the banquet (Isa. v. 12; Amos vi. 5), and were already found in the court of David.

The last two words of the Verse (shiddah v'shiddoth), which I have ventured to render, "concubines of all sorts," are of essentially doubtful interpretation. From the earliest time they have been rendered in all manner of different ways. The Greek interpreters are not agreed among themselves, and Jerome here follows Aquila, whilst the Targum and the Midrash give other explanations; and some of the later Rabbis again depart from the Targum and the Midrash. A bare enumeration of these interpretations will show what uncertainty hangs over the words. Thus the LXX. has οἰνοχόους καὶ οἰνοχόας—"cupbearers male and female," which is also the explanation of the Syriac; Aquila, κυλίκιον καὶ κυλίκια—"goblets of various kinds," and similarly Jerome, "scyphos et urceos in ministerio ad

vina fundanda: Symmachus, according to Jerome, "the setting out of tables"-mensarum (so, no doubt, and not mensurarum, should be read) species et appositiones; the Targum, "public baths," deriving the word from a root signifying "to pour out," and explaining that it refers to "pipes which pour out tepid water and pipes which pour out hot water;" the Midrash gives this explanation, and also another-"demons and demonesses," which Solomon, by his spells and magic arts, had made subservient to him; Qimkhi has, "all manner of musical instruments:" and this is followed by Luther and by our Authorized Version. Others explain, "chariot and chariots," especially "chariots for women;" others, "palanquins," or "litters," or think that these are put for the women who are carried in them. Others again, "lady and ladies," or "concubine and concubines," giving, however, different derivations to the word. Or, lastly, the words are not to have any special signification attached to them, but are to be regarded as a general expression, meaning "heap and heaps," and thus intended to amplify the words immediately preceding "the delights of the sons of men in great abundance." I

Two things only are clear; first, that the Hebrew idiom here employed, the repetition of the same noun in the singular and in the plural, denotes plurality with variety; secondly, that placed, as these words are, at the close of an enumeration, they must be designed to form a climax either by lending intensity to the last step of the series (thus the rendering will be, "in great abundance"), or as introducing some new feature more marked and prominent than the rest, as crowning the edifice of this "colossal apparatus" of worldly splendour

¹ So Ewald, Elster, Zörkler, Hengstenberg—" die Hülle und Fülle."

and self-gratification. On the whole, making the fullest allowance for the obscurity in which the words are enveloped and the uncertainty of the etymology, I have adopted the sense which seems best to harmonize with the context. It is scarcely credible that in so ample a description of Solomon's magnificence and luxury there should have been no reference at all to the harem of the monarch who had "three hundred wives and seven hundred concubines."

Verse o.—All this was on a scale of unexampled splendour and magnificence, the like of which had never been seen before in Jerusalem. And as in the former experiments, so in this, he was master of himself: Moreover, my wisdom remained with me (or, as the words may be rendered, my wisdom assisted me). If he indulged the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, this was from no mere love of ostentation, no vulgar extravagance. The labour of his hands was itself a pleasure. For a while it served to divert him from anxious and bitter thoughts. There was a satisfaction in it so long as he could occupy himself with it; it was a joy to his heart, and this was his portion for all his labour. But when he turned seriously and thoughtfully to look at it all, when he reflected how soon he himself must leave all that he had amassed, how it would pass into other hands, how impossible it was to tell what use the next possessor would make of it; the old trouble returned, the old feeling of weariness, the old sense of the vanity of earthly things. Wisdom might excel folly as far as light excelled darkness, but wisdom itself could not give a man the power of deriving satisfaction from his pursuits, or make of them an enduring possession. I. I. STEWART PEROWNE.

SANCTIFIED IN THE WIFE.

I CORINTHIANS VII. 14.

In this article I shall attempt to explain a confessedly difficult Verse in the writings of St. Paul: and, the better to do so, I shall begin by a short exposition of the four preceding Verses.

The words τοις δε γεγαμηκόσιν, placed for emphasis at the beginning of Verse 10, mark out the persons to whom St. Paul now speaks, in broad contrast to those addressed in Verses 8 and 9. We may render them, But to those who are married; or, in colloquial English, But to those who have got married. Only thus, by a double translation, can we reproduce the full force of the Greek perfect, which always connects a past event with a present state. To these married persons, whether married before or since their conversion, the advice contained in Verses 8 and 9 does not apply. But for them St. Paul has a charge much more solemn than his words to the unmarried. And his charge is not from the pen of an Apostle, but from the lips of Christ, the Lord of the Church. It is to the effect that a married woman do not separate herself from her husband. Thus I translate the concluding words of the Verse. It is better, here and in the next Verse, to render the aorist subjunctive by our English reflexive, thus adding to the sense of the passive, but adding to it only an idea clearly contained in the context, viz., that the separation is the woman's own act, rather than to lose the force of the aorist, which directs our attention to the event of separation.

The charge here attributed to Christ corresponds exactly with his words as recorded in Matthew xix. 6. And, that St. Paul quotes it as his, taking for granted that it will be at once recognized as having come from his lips, proves that, in this point at least, the traditional teaching embodied in the Gospels was known, and admitted to be genuine, in St. Paul's day and in a far-off foreign city. This Verse is thus one of the many testimonies in this Epistle to the correctness of the Gospels as records of the teaching of Jesus.

The beginning of Verse II may be rendered, But if she do separate herself. The aorist subjunctive points to a future possible event, which the particle kal raises into conspicuous prominence. The rendering, if she be already separated, is, therefore, inadmissible: it would represent el with the indicative, as in Verse 12, noting something which already is or is not a matter of fact. But St. Paul merely contemplates the possibility that for some reason, sufficient or insufficient, the general injunction of Christ will not be obeyed; and, by way of parenthesis, says that in this case the only alternative is to remain single or to be reconciled to the husband. His words are but a restatement of an injunction of Christ even more strict than the one quoted above.

That the case of the woman is mentioned first, and that only to her is this parenthetical injunction given, suggests that a special case of this sort had been mentioned in the Corinthian letter to St. Paul (see Verse 1);

¹ Mark x. 12.

or that women were more likely than men to seek such separation. The latter supposition is not improbable. We can well conceive that some wives thought that the complete change consequent on their conversion was sufficient reason for seeking freedom from what they felt to be an unsuitable alliance, even though it were an alliance with a husband who, like his wife, had accepted Christianity. To such women St. Paul recalls the Saviour's words against the separation of married people and his strong words against the re-marriage of those who separate.

While professing to speak to married people generally. St. Paul has really spoken words applicable only to Christian couples. For the case of those married to heathens was so different from the cases referred to by Christ, in which both partners were professed servants of the true God, that, as St. Paul feels, the injunctions of Christ do not cover it. In other words, there is a remnant embraced neither by St. Paul's advice in Verses 8 and 9 to the unmarried and the widows, nor by the just mentioned commands of Christ. To this remnant, to the rest, St. Paul now speaks; but speaks only on his own authority. For them, as for the virgins (Verse 25), he has no command of the Lord. No words of Christ exactly meet their case.

To Christians, men or women, married to unbelievers, St. Paul speaks with great caution. Idolatry was so closely bound up with social life that he cannot press a Christian to remain with a heathen husband or wife. Yet he inclines to this as generally desirable. If each is disposed to live with the other (συνευδοκεί: "joins with him in being disposed to continue the union"), St. Paul recommends this course as best.

The complete parallel of Verses 12 and 13 marks the complete equality of the sexes in conjugal rights: an equality unknown apart from Christianity. Even the word of authority— $\mathring{a}\phi\iota\acute{e}\tau\omega$ (dismiss), is used of the woman as well as of the man. It was perhaps suggested in Verse 13 by a sense both of the dignity of the Christian wife and of the loss she could inflict on the heathen husband by refusing to live with him.

The preposition $\gamma \acute{a} \rho$, which introduces Verse 14, indicates that in some way this Verse supports the foregoing injunctions. That these injunctions are practically but a permission to do what the parties are supposed already to wish $(\sigma v \nu \epsilon v \delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{i})$ suggests that the Verse which supports them will remove a possible objection to this wish. And the word $\dot{\eta} \gamma (a \sigma \tau a \iota)$, placed twice in the most prominent position, suggests the kind of objection which St. Paul has in view.

Under the Mosaic covenant, marriage with a heathen was strictly forbidden. The reason given is: "For a holy people thou art to Jehovah thy God. In thee Jehovah thy God hath set his choice, that thou mayest be to him a people of special possession." Therefore, "the seed of holiness" must not "mingle themselves with the people of the lands." Consequently, although the evil was widely spread, Ezra (x. 11, 19) not only forbad it for the future, but compelled the Jewish husbands to put away their heathen wives, even those who had borne them children. It might, therefore, be thought that Christian husbands and wives ought not to live with partners who refused Christianity, and that, consequently, the injunction of Christ referred to in Verse 11 would not apply to them.

² See Deut, vii. 3; Neh. xiii, 25-27. ² Deut, vii. 6, ³ Ezra ix. 2.

To this objection, one likely to occur to all students of the Jewish Scriptures, St. Paul now replies; and thus supports the advice against which the objection might be brought. He declares that the unbelieving husband, heathen though he be, is not unholy, but holy. For he has been sanctified in the wife; i.e., he has been made holy in virtue of the holiness of his wife. In what sense are these words true? That they are true in a sense which proves that a Christian wife need not separate from her heathen husband, St. Paul's argument requires. And for such a sense we will now seek.

The latter part of Verse 14, which gives, and professes to give, a proof of the startling assertions contained in the former part of the same Verse, will also explain their meaning. And the word *holy* will be specially valuable as an indication of the meaning of the cognate and very conspicuous word *sanctified*.

The particle $a\rho a$, essentially a logical particle, implies that the assertion which follows it is an inference from those preceding. And $e\pi \epsilon i$ indicates that this inference justifies the assertions from which it is drawn. The particles $v\hat{v}v$ $\delta \epsilon$, which may be paraphrased, But as things actually are, introduce a statement which, by its evident contradiction of Your children are unclean, shews that these words are not actually true, but are only a necessary inference from an assumption which is now proved to be incorrect by the absurdity of the inference which it logically involves. In other words, we have here a very forceful reductio ad absurdum. St. Paul declares that if the unbelieving husband be not sanctified in his Christian wife, then we must infer

¹ Comp. Chap. xii. 18, xv. 20.

that the children of believers generally are unclean, whereas, on the principle just laid down, viz., sanctified in the wife, the children are holy. And this last proposition, which negatives the one just before it, St. Paul takes for granted.

This use of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, viz., to support an assertion by shewing the absurdity consequent upon a denial of it, is very common.¹ We may conveniently render it "else;" or, preserving its relation to the ordinary use of the same conjunction, by the words "since otherwise."

The collocation of enel and apa is found again in I Corinthians v. 10. But in this case there is no contrasted statement which by its evident truth marks out the inference as false. Therefore, to shew this, St. Paul puts the inference in the imperfect indicative. (according to the well-attested reading ώφείλετε,) thus bringing it under the fourth case of the hypothetical proposition. But in I Corinthians vii. 14, the contrasted and evidently correct statement, But now are they holy, makes this unnecessary. And the indicative present is more graphic, shewing what would be the actual state of things if the foregoing assertions were not true. Similarly, in 1 Corinthians xv. 18, a sentence introduced by "apa disproves the assertion" That there is no resurrection," by shewing that it involves the assertion that "they who have been laid to sleep in Christ have perished." This latter assertion is, in St. Paul's view, so evidently false that it needs neither express contradiction as in 1 Corinthians vii. 14, nor the imperfect tense as in Chapter v. Verse 10. He is, therefore, at liberty to make use of the much more forceful agrist indicative.

¹ Compare Rom. iii. 6; xi. 6, 22; Heb. v. 11; ix. 26; x. 2.

So much for the grammatical form of the verse. St. Paul argues that the heathen husband is sanctified in the wife, on the ground that otherwise we should be compelled to infer that the children of unbelievers are unclean; whereas, as he assumes, they are holy.

To understand the real force of this argument, we must determine the exact sense in it of the word "holy." To speak generally, this word denotes, both in the Old and New Testaments, that which God has claimed to be his own, and which, therefore, stands in a special relation to Him as his property, as existing for Him, and designed to work out his purposes. And, in Old Testament language, various objects were pronounced "unclean," to indicate that contact with them would unfit the otherwise holy person for the presence and service of God. In other words, the holy must not touch the unholy. It might, therefore, be thought that the Christian wife, whom in a far deeper sense than under the Mosaic covenant God had claimed to be his own and to live for Him, must needs separate herself from an unholy heathen husband, lest intercourse with him should mar her service of God. St. Paul says, No; and supports his denial by shewing that if she leave her husband she must for the same reason leave her children. And he makes this a personal and forceful appeal to the whole Church by passing from the third to the second person—your children; thus including the children not only of Christians married to unbelievers, but of Christians generally. The word children includes sons and daughters of all ages. Many of these had not yet exercised faith in Christ;

¹ So Lange in vol. v., just published, of the second edition of Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie: "To sanctify is to take from the world and give to the Lord."

and doubtless some were adult idolaters. Yet it is quite evident that, whatever the children were, the parents not only were not bound by their new relation to God to leave them, but were bound, even in spite of their rejection of Christianity, to render them the full measure of parental love and care. In other words, intercourse with unconverted children does not defile a Christian parent. In this sense, then, the children are not unclean, but are holy. But on what principle can this be? Only on this, that the mother's holiness extends in some sense to the children: and that, whatever they may be in themselves, from her point of view and in the subjective world of her inner life they are holy. She lays them on the altar of God, and henceforth looks upon them as belonging to Him, and cares for them as part of her service of Christ. In this sense they are sanctified in the mother.

Now this principle applies equally to the heathen husband of a Christian wife. In her inner life he also is laid upon the altar. To her, therefore, he is a holy object; and her intercourse with him is a service of God. And if so, his presence, heathen though he be, will not defile her. On the contrary, by giving occasion for Christian patience and watchfulness, it will develop her Christian character. Therefore the heathenism of the husband is no reason why she may not follow the advice given in Verse 13. And the same argument applies to the Christian husband of a heathen wife.

Notice the indicative mood, is sanctified. Yet these words describe, not that which actually and always takes place, but that which ought always to be. It may be that the wife fails in some degree to lay her husband upon the altar of God, and to look upon her intercourse

with him as a service of God, that she looks upon him simply as her human lord, and seeks his favour rather than the favour of God. If so, the heathen husband defiles the wife; and the holiness of the one is lost in the unholiness of the other. But this need not be. It is the wife's privilege, in spite of anything the husband can do, to serve God in all her dealings with him; and, if so, the wickedness of the husband will but develop her spiritual life. And that this is her privilege is sufficient proof that she is not obliged to leave her heathen husband. This is all St. Paul wishes to prove. If she is not disposed to remain, he tacitly (συνευζοκεί) permits her to leave her husband. What it is her privilege to do, St. Paul, as his wont is, represents as her actual conduct, thus giving her the strongest encouragement to make it such.

Under the special case which in this paper I have attempted to elucidate lies a broad and important principle, bearing upon all men in all ages. There are many circumstances and connections which seem to hinder the Christian life, or to make it impossible. They seem to be unholy, and therefore defiling. From some of these we may free ourselves, and are bound to do so. To remain, of our own choice and without a good reason, in circumstances unfavourable to religion is most dangerous. But there may be circumstances from which it is impossible or inexpedient to free ourselves, and which, nevertheless, seem to be incompatible with full-hearted service of God. And, because of these drawbacks, many have thought themselves debarred from being servants of God. But there is another view of this case. That we cannot free ourselves from these unfavourable circumstances,

proves that God, in whose hands are all things, does not think fit that we should be free from them. Yet He loves us, and designs us to be his servants. From all this we are compelled to infer that the service of God is not really incompatible with these apparently adverse circumstances. In order to serve God, all that we need is to lay all our surroundings upon his altar, and to look upon them as ordained or permitted by Him to give occasion to Christian virtues, and thus to develop our spiritual life. And if we do this, even our adverse circumstances will be to us holy, i.e., they will, in our inner life, stand in special relation to God as ordained by Him, and as working out his purposes of mercy for us and for others. "All things" will "work together for our good." Just as of old the altar sanctified the gift, claiming it for God, so the believer, by his own devotion to God, claims for his service his entire surroundings.

The Verse we have been studying has been claimed both as proof and as disproof that Infant Baptism was practised in the Apostolic Church. But that the words *Your children are holy* do not in any way imply that the children of Christian parents are fit objects for baptism, is evident from the fact that the holiness of the children is mentioned only to prove the holiness of the heathen husband or wife. And a holiness shared by adult heathens cannot be valid ground for a Christian rite.

Much more difficult is it to decide whether this Verse may be accepted as evidence that the children of believers were not then baptized. This is held by Neander, Meyer, Stanley, and others, on the ground that, if the children had been baptized, the difference

between them and the unbaptized husband would bar all argument from one to the other. That St. Paul did not find it necessary to say, "Your unbaptized children," suggests, perhaps, that baptism in infancy was not then very usual. But on this argument no great stress can fairly be laid. Whether or not the children were baptized, and whether they were infants or adults, they had an indisputable claim to the care of their Christian parents. Therefore, to render them such care could in no case defile the parent. Consequently, the matter of baptism had no bearing whatever upon the case. And this is a sufficient reason for the absence of all mention of the rite, even though it had been administered to some of the children. Similarly, as not affecting the argument, no mention is made of those "children" who had accepted Christianity. Yet it would be unfair to infer from this that none of the children of the believers at Corinth were themselves believers. It is, therefore, unsafe to draw from this Verse any inference about Infant Baptism.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

IMMANUEL.

ISAIAH VII. 14.

God was with Isaiah in an even deeper sense than with any other of the Hebrew prophets. Isaiah was, indeed, the St. John of that "goodly fellowship"—the prophet whom Jehovah loved. As we read his scriptures, we cannot but feel that he was admitted to a closer, a more inward and spiritual, fellowship with God than any of his brethren, knew more of his mind,

had more of his spirit, rose to a larger prevision of "the grace and the truth" which "came by Jesus Christ." That, indeed, is what we mean when we call him "the Evangelical prophet," and speak of his writings as "the Evangel of the Old Testament." He had seen God face to face; it was the vision of "the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up," which made him a prophet. What he had seen, others might see. It was the ruling task and endeavour of his life to make them see it.

1. The burden of his prophecy to the nation, and to the world, was, God is with us; not far from us, though we have wandered far from Him: not alienated from us, though we have alienated ourselves from the life that is in Him; not adverse to us, though by our disobedience we have set ourselves against Him: but with us and for us-with us, to cleanse us from all our sins, now by the judgments which punish sin and now by the love that forgives it; with us that, having cleansed us from every taint of sin, He may establish us in righteousness. In effect He said to the sinful and affrighted people: "You need not climb to heaven in order to find God, nor cross the troubled sea, nor plunge into the dark shadows of Hades: He is with you, and within you, and proves Himself to be with you by the response which my words awaken in your hearts. Would you find Him, look within. You have only to look and listen to discover that He is already, and always, with you."

Now this is the evangelical tone; this is the good news which Christ has brought to all the world, which He illustrated in his life and demonstrated by his

¹ Isa. vi. 1-8.

death. And hence we very rightly name Isaiah "the Evangelical prophet," and find in his words the clearest and fullest anticipations of the Gospel.

2. Isaiah summed up his gospel, summed up, that is, the burden of his teaching as well as of his personal experience, in the name he gave to one of his sons. Beyond a doubt Isaiah's little son was a figure of Him that was to come, of Him who, being Himself both God and man, was most emphatically "God with us." But of this supreme and divine Immanuel it is not our present purpose to speak. For the present let us fix our thoughts on the first and inferior Immanuel, on the child who embodied Isaiah's great message to the men of Judah.

His great message, but not his only message. The conditions of the time were, indeed, too complex, and its moral condition too depraved, to admit of only one prophetic message. It was necessary that the Prophet should bring more messages from God than onemessages of warning as well as messages of comfort -to a people that had wellnigh lost God. Isaiah had to admonish them of the due reward, the natural consequences, of their iniquity, as well as to assure them that, despite their iniquity, God would never leave nor forsake them. The time was terribly out of joint, and there were few who even strove to set it right. And hence the people of Judah were threatened with nothing short of extinction. All their choice and trained warriors-"sons of might"-had fallen in a single day before the confederated armies of Israel and Syria. These armies, flushed with victory, were advancing to the siege and assault of Jerusalem itself. And, though Isajah foresaw that the assault would fail, that the

hostile Confederation would be broken up, he also foresaw that a State so corrupt and godless as Judah had become had doomed itself to destruction: that it must fall before the first vigorous, resolute, and steadfast onset. God would be "with them" for the present indeed, and so with them as to deliver them from their immediate danger. And God would also be with them in the hour of apparent annihilation, watching over them in their captivity, and bringing back "a righteous remnant" to repeople their wasted land. But they must not hope to escape the natural results of their own weakness and division and corruption. The years were fast approaching in which the fierce and hasty Assyrians would "speed to the spoil and hasten to the booty," ravaging and depopulating both the holy land and the holy city.

These were the various messages, or various parts of one complex message, which Isaiah was commissioned to deliver. And it is very striking to observe how, not content with mere words, he embodied them in his own family life, in the very names he gave to his children and the children of the virgin-prophetess whom he took for his second bride. The Hebrews, like most Eastern races, were very quick to see the omen in the nomen, the sign or portent in the name. Isaiah's own name meant "the salvation of Jehovah," and therefore expressed the ruling tone and purport of his mission. And of set purpose and design he so named his three boys as that they too might bear witness among the people for God, and remind them both of the admonitory and the consolatory aspects

¹ This is not the only interpretation of which the narrative imbedded in the earlier Chapters of Isaiah is susceptible: but probably it is the best, the most widely accepted by modern scholars.—Editor.

of his great message. Thus he named one of them Maher-shalal-hash-baz, which means, "Speed-spoil Hasten-booty," in order to fix and perpetuate his warning that the fierce and terrible Assyrians would ere long sweep through the land, despoiling it of its wealth and making its inhabitants their prev. He named another son "Shear-jashub," which means, "A-remnantshall-return," to remind them that, even when that terrible judgment fell upon them, and they were carried away captive to a strange land, God would not suffer them to be wholly consumed, but would preserve a sacred seed, a righteous remnant, from which a new and purer national life might spring. 2 And now he calls a third son,3 the first by his new bride, Immanuel, to remind them that, whether in adversity or in prosperity, in freedom or in bondage, God would always be with them and for them—not absent, not alienated. not adverse.4

¹ Isa. viii. I-4. ² Isa. vii. 3; x. 20-23.

³ The true rendering in Isaiah vii. 14, is probably, "And thou shalt call his name Immanuel."

⁴ A curious and, so far as I know, unnoticed parallel to the significant names of Isaiah's three children may be found in the names which the prophet Hosea gave to his three children by the immediate direction of Jehovah. Hosea was commissioned to warn the house of Israel that a day of retribution was at hand, on which God would reject them as not his people, and refuse to have mercy upon them; and to promise that this day of storm and cloud should be followed by a still ampler day of brightness and compassion, on which He would once more acknowledge them as his own and would have mercy upon them. This complex message, like that of Isaiah, was embodied in the names of the Prophet's children. Of his firstborn the Lord said (Hosea i. 4) unto him: "Call his name Jezreel; for yet a little while and I will avenge the blood of Jezrcel"-i.e., the blood shed on the fertile plain of Jezreel by Ahab and Jezebel-"upon the house of Jehu, and will put an end to the monarchy of the house of Israel." Of his second son the Lord said (Chap. i. 9): "Call his name Lo-anmi (i.e., "Not-my-people"); for ye are not my people, and I will be none of yours." And of his daughter it is said (Chap. i. 6): "Call her name Lo-ruhamah (i.e., "Not-pitied"); for I will no more have pity upon the house of Israel." So far we hear only notes of warning and menace: but in Chapter ii. Verse 23, they pass into a gracious and hopeful music. For here the prophetic significance of these names is played upon and

And that this was, as has been said, Isaiah's great and ruling message, that his mission was one of comfort mainly, and not mainly one of judgment and warning, becomes evident to us-not only as we catch the tone and spirit of his writings, but—as soon as we consider the household names which led him to exclaim: 1 "Behold. I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for portents in Israel!" For, if one of these names implied judgment, three of them implied mercy. The omen in the name "Speedspoil Hasten-booty" was doubtless full of terror; for the Assyrians were the most fierce and cruel race of ancient times, and would sweep through the land like a destructive storm; but, if this one name was so terribly ominous and suggestive, all the others speak of an untiring and inalienable compassion: "Shear-jashub" predicted that God would bring back a faithful remnant even from the cruel bondage of Assyria; "Immanuel" assured them that God would be with them in all their perils and reverses: while the name of Isaiah himself pointed to the end of all Jehovah's dealings with them-"salvation" from all evil

3. But now, after this brief glance at the whole of this strange prophetic household, let us confine our attention to the little son whom Isaiah named Immanuel; or, rather, since we know nothing of him, let

brought out in a promise bright with the hope of renewed life and restored favour to the sinful nation; and even the appellative meaning of the firstborn's name, not touched before, is woven into the promise. The meaning of the word Jezreel is "God sows," and the Verse, crowded with an immense significance, runs thus: "And I will sow her (i.e., the nation) for myself in the land; and I will have pity upon Not-pitied (Lo-ruhamah); and I will say to Not-my-people (Lo-ammi), Thou art my people, and she shall say to me, My God."—EDITOR.

I sa. viii, 18.

us confine our thoughts to the meaning of his name and the reasons for which it was given him.

"Immanuel" means, we say, "God with us." that is true, but true in a way which robs the name of half its force. We have but to pronounce the word deliberately, Immanu-cl, to see that the Sacred Name El is the final syllable of it; and that, to be quite exact, we ought to translate it not, "God with us," but "With us God." Now "God with us" conveys much; but turn it round and say. "With us God," i.e., place the emphasis rightly, and surely the word conveys much more both to the intellect and the heart. For then we see that God is not simply with us as He is with all his creatures and works, but with us in some emphatic and pre-eminent sense. With us as He cannot be with the non-intelligent creatures around us, who can make no moral response to a Presence of which they are not conscious. Nay, more; with usso the emphasis seems to imply, and so the history of the Name assures us-though we have too much reason to fear that He may have abandoned us; our Friend and Saviour, although we may deem Him our Adversary; with us, although we are not consciously with Him; for us, although we have been against Him; with us in the hour of judgment no less than in the days of his bounty: with us and for us when He smites us for our sins, no less than when He forgives our sins, since He does but smite that, being smitten, we may turn and repent, and suffer Him to be once more gracious unto us.

And to those who have any real and deep sense of their personal iniquity, to whom the confession of sin and the prayer for absolution are not mere words but

sacred and impressive realities; to those to whom the defiling taints and depraving processes of sin bring an agony beyond all others; to as many as make it the supreme endeavour of life to escape from the bondage of evil and to rise into their right relation with God and man, the message of this Word, the assurance that, despite their alienations and transgressions, God is with them and for them, with them in all the agony of their self-abasement, and for them in all their futileseeming endeavours after righteousness—this is of all messages the most welcome they can hear. It melts and deepens their sorrow into a cleansing and saving penitence; it lends new life and vigour and steadfastness to their endeavours and their hopes. And this was the message borne to his generation by Isaiah's little son: this is the message which every servant of God is sent to bear to his weak and sinful fellow-servants. The light of God's love does not cease to shine because for a while it is intercepted by the clouds which it has drawn up from our transgressions, or from our indifference, or from our too constant traffic and undue devotion to the things that are seen and temporal: it shines on a steadfast and eternal light, ripening every seed of good within us, however slow and obstructed the growth may be, and for ever testifying to us that. even though there be as yet no visible sign of harvest. in due time we shall reap if we faint not.

Yes, and shall reap, even if we do faint and lose hope for a time. Professor Tyndall has told us how, as he wandered through the higher Alpine pastures in the earlier months of the present summer, he was often surprised to find at evening lovely flowers in full bloom where in the morning he had seen only a wide

thin sheet of snow. Struck with the strange phenomenon, unable to believe that a few hours of even the most fervent sunshine had drawn these exquisite flowers to their full maturity, he carefully scraped away the snow from a few inches of pasture, and examined the plants that were growing beneath it. And, to his surprise and delight, he found that the powers of life had been with them even while they seemed wrapped in death; that the sun had reached them through the snow; that the snow itself had both held down the rising warmth of the earth upon them, and sheltered them from the cold biting winds which might else have destroyed them. There they stood, each full grown, every flower maturely developed, though the green calvx was carefully folded over the delicately coloured petals; and no sooner was the snow removed, no sooner did the rays of the sun touch the green enfolding calvx, than it opened and revealed the perfect beauty it had shrouded and preserved. And so, doubtless, we shall one day find that God, our Sun, has been with us even during the winter of our selfdiscontent, all through the hours of apparent failure and inertness, quickening in us a life of which we gave but little sign, maturing and making us perfect by the things we suffered; so that when the hindering veils are withdrawn, and the full light of his love shines upon us, at that gracious touch we too may disclose a beauty of which we had not dreamed, and of which for long we gave no promise.

4. If we ask why Isaiah gave this Name to his son, no doubt we must answer, as has already been said, that his main reason was that he meant the Name to convey his great message, the burden of all his pro-

phecies to the people to whom he had been sent; to be an outward and visible sign of the inward and invisible presence of God, a constant sign of a constant Presence: he meant it to testify that God was with them, and would be with them, amid all the changes of the national life, and even in that great catastrophe which would seem to bring the national life to an end, but which, purging and renewing it, would only start it afresh on a new and larger career.

5. But he may have had other reasons than this. He may have meant the name to speak to him as well as to the nation. He may have desired to bring the message of the Name into his personal and family life. For, after all, a prophet is but a man of like passions with ourselves, subject to the same infirmities and fluctuations of spirit, "warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer." There were times, no doubt, when even Isaiah lost faith in his own function, in his own message, when the very man who had assured a sinful nation that God was with them could hardly believe that God was with him, or could even cry out, "Depart from me, O Lord, for I am a sinful man!" And in such moments as these, when, weary of the world and weary of himself, he lost courage and hope, he may have felt that it would be well for him to have that in his very household which would help to recall the truths he had recognized and taught in hours of clearer insight, help to restore the faith with which he had first sprung up to greet the Divine message. We may well believe that there were many darkened hours in his experience, hours of broken faith and defeated hope, when he would fall back on his earlier faith and brighter hopes; when he would call his little son to him, and, as he fondled him, would repeat his name, Immanuel, Immanuel—God-with-us, God-with-us—and find in that Name a charm potent to restore his waning trust in the gracious presence and gracious will of Jehovah.

6. And, finally, Isaiah may have felt, as we feel, that God is with a little child in quite another sense, in a more pathetic sense, than He is with grown men. To him, as to us, their innocence, their loveliness, and above all their love, may have been the most exquisite revelation of the purity and love of God. "Heaven lies about their infancy;" and in this heaven the Prophet may often have taken refuge from his cares, despondencies, and fears. Every child born into the world brings this message to us, reminds us that God is with us indeed and of a truth; for whence did this new, pure, tender life come if not from the central Fountain of life and purity and love?

And from this point of view Isaiah's "Immanuel" is but the ancient analogue of our Lord's tender words: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

THE BOOK OF JOB.

VII.—THE INTERVENTION OF ELIHU.

SECOND DISCOURSE (CHAPTER XXXIV.)

ELIHU has already addressed himself directly to the Friends (Chap. xxxii.), and to Job (Chap. xxxiii.); he had accused *them* of condemning a man whom they could not refute, and *him* of charging with silence and indifference the God who speaks to men in many ways. And now he turns and addresses himself to the by-

standers, who had eagerly followed every wind and double of this great inquest and argument. Apt as we are to forget them, he renders it quite impossible for us to forget them throughout this second discourse. He appeals to them again and again (Verses 2, 10, 16, 34), and always with the profoundest respect, as "sages" and "wise men," "men of heart" and "men of experience." And if in these terms of respect there be some touch of that tone of compliment by which an orator seeks to propitiate his audience, we yet have no reason to suspect Elihu's sincerity. For, doubtless, there were in his audience many aged and experienced men for whom he would feel a natural deference; even compliments may be sincere; a deferential tone is natural and becoming, especially in a young man, in addressing a public audience: and, at the lowest, Elihu, with many another orator, might well plead on behalf of the respectful epithets he lavishes on his hearers, "I do but

bring a trumpet to awake their ears, To set their sense on the attentive bent, And then to speak."

Nor, if we consider his theme, is it without good reason that, at this point, he should turn from Job and the Friends to appeal to a larger audience. For his theme, the equity of the Divine Providence, was the standing problem of the ancient world, as indeed with many it is a standing and unsolved problem, an open and much-debated question, to this day. Every man on the *mezbele* was as profoundly interested in it as Job himself, though less vividly conscious of his interest; and one can almost feel the thrill of quickened and eager attention with which they would listen to

Elihu, as this "wise young man" uttered appeal after appeal, and produced argument after argument to prove that the sorrowful and chequered lot of man is ordered by an unfailing Justice and Love.

Job had impugned that Justice (Verses 5-9). Elihu asserts it (Verses 10, 11), and adduces arguments for it of the most philosophic reach. (a) He argues (Verses 12 151 that God cannot be inequitable, since it was of his own will that He made the universe, since it is by his quickening breath that all creatures are sustained in being; the government of the world is not an unwelcome duty, a laborious task, imposed upon Him from without; it is freely assumed, freely borne, freely discharged; so that He has no possible motive for heedlessness or injustice. (3) He argues (Verses 16-16) that He who rules the world age after age must be just, since injustice is sooner or later fatal to authority; and, had He been unjust, the King of the Universe would long since have been dethroned. And (y) he argues (Verses 20-30) that in point of fact God is just; that history itself, if only taken on the large scale, proves Him to be the foe of all injustice, proves that, though He may suffer fraud and wrong to sit in high places for a time, yet when the due moment comes He crushes them in a moment, striking them down to ruin with an unseen hand indeed, yet "in the eyes of all beholders." Having stated his theme and adduced his arguments, Elihu draws his conclusion (Verses 31-37): his conclusion is that humility and penitence become the man who, under a rule so just, is afflicted and brought low; that, instead of asserting his own righteousness, or questioning the righteousness of the great Ruler of men, he should confess his sin, steadfastly

purpose amendment, and ask for a clearer insight into the ways of God. And in this conclusion he is sure that all "wise persons" will agree.

Thus Elihu brings his argument home to Fob, whom he has not forgotten while appealing to the bystanders, whose attention to this argument he had earnestly challenged (Chap. xxxiii. 31-33) before he appealed to them.

	CHAPTER XXXIV.
	And Elihu took up his discourse and said:
2.	Hear my words, O ye sages,
	And give ear to me, ye men of knowledge,
3.	For the ear testeth words
	As the palate testeth food!
4.	Let us prove what is right,
•	Let us learn of one another what is good:
5.	For Fob hath said, "I am righteous,
	But God hath taken away my right;
6,	Though my cause be just, I pass for a liar;
	Grievous is my arrow, though I am without sin."
7.	Who is a man like Fob,
	That drinketh down scoffing like water,
8,	And goeth over to the evildoers,
	And walketh with men of wickedness?
9.	For he said, "It profiteth a man nothing
	That he should delight himself in God."
IO.	Therefore hearken unto me, ye men of understanding:—
	Far be iniquity from God,
	And injustice from the Almighty!
II.	He requiteth every man according to his deed,
	And according to his work he recompenseth him.
12.	Yea, of a truth, God cannot be inequitable,
	Nor can the Almighty wrest justice.
13.	Who hath given him the earth in charge;
	Or who hath laid the universe upon Him?
14.	Were He intent on Himself alone,
	He would gather to Himself his spirit and his breath;
15.	All flesh would expire together,
	And man would return to dust.

16.	Now hear this, if ye have understanding,
	Give ear to the voice of my words:
I 7.	Can he that hateth justice rule?
	And wilt thou condemn the Just, the Mighty One?
rS.	Is it to be said to a king, "O worthless man!"
	And to princes, "O ye wicked!"
19.	Here newer less to Him who accepteth not the person of nobles,
	Nor regardeth the rich more than the poor,
	Since they are all the work of his hands?
20.	In a moment they die;
	Even at midnight the people are overthrown and perish;
	The mighty are taken off by an unseen hand:
21.	For his eyes are on the ways of man,
	And He beholdeth all his steps;
22.	There is no darkness nor blackness of death
	Wherein they that do evil can hide themselves;
23.	For God need not look at a man twice
	When He would bring him into judgment.
24.	He breaketh in pieces mighty men without inquisition,
	And setteth up others in their stead,
25.	For He knoweth well their deeds:
	He overthroweth them in the night and they are crushed;
6.	Because they are wicked, He striketh them
	In the open sight of all,
7.	Because they turned away from after Him,
	And considered none of his ways,
8.	So that they caused the cry of the poor to go up before Him:
	For He heareth the cry of the afflicted.
9.	When He giveth peace, who can condemn Him?
	But who can behold Him when He hideth his face,
	Whether from a nation or only from a man,
0.	Because the wicked reign
	And the people are ensnared?
I.	Surely it is meet to say unto God,
	"I have borne; I will not offend again:
2.	That which I see not shew Thou me,
	That if I have done wrong, I may do it no more."
3.	Shall He requite thee as thou deemest right,
	As you reject, as you choose, but not He?
	Say what thou knowest.
4.	Men of understanding will say to me,
	And wise persons who hear me,

35. "Fob hath spoken without knowledge,
And his words are devoid of wisdom."
36. Would that Fob might be proved to the uttermost
For his answers are like those of the wicked:
37. For he addeth mutiny to his sin,
He clappeth his hands among us,
And multiplieth his words against God.

Elihu commences his address to the wise and experienced men around him by appealing to that moral sense in man which discriminates between word and word, argument and argument, action and action, and pronounces on their ethical value -- a sense in which they, no less than he, as entirely believed as in the physical sense which tastes and discriminates between food and food, flavour and flavour. The figure or proverb in which he couches this appeal (Verse 3) had been used by Job himself (Chap. xii. 11), and had influenced the form of many Verses in the Poem (e.g., Chap. vi. 6, 7; and Chap. xxxiii. 2). The figure indeed rests on one of those obvious and inevitable analogies which have entered into the literature of every race. Thus, for example, Shakespeare makes the wise Nestor say to the crafty Ulysses:

> Now I begin to *relish* thy advice, And I will give *a taste* of it forthwith To Agamemnon;

and more than once the same Poet teaches us that as "by our ears our hearts oft tainted be," so through our ears there often reaches our hearts that salt of wisdom by which the taint is cured. As they listen to him Elihu would have his hearers exercise their moral sense, testing and proving his words that they may admit only those which are true, and unite with him in the quest of that which is good (Verse 4).

In Ferrare 5 and 6 he states, or restates (Comp. Chap. XXXIII. 0 11), the assertion of Job to which he is about to reply, and states it with his usual fairness. In so many words Job had affirmed as against God, "I know that I have right on my side" (Chap. xiii. 18); he had maintained that he had "kept" the way of righteousness and had not "turned aside" from that way (Chap. xxiii. 11, 12), but that nevertheless God had embittered his soul by denying him the simplest justice and treating him as one of the wicked (Chap. xxvii. 2). By disregarding his asseveration of personal and undeviating righteousness God had caused him to "pass for a liar" even with those who knew him best-and, indeed, the Friends had been only too forward to give him both the lie oblique and the lie direct. The very image of Verse 6—" Grievous is my arrow"—is taken from the mouth of Job: "Lo, the arrows of the Almighty are in me, and their venom drinketh up my spirit" (Chap. vi. 4), and is plainly a milder version of Job's complaint, since it passes by the wild passionate charge that God had dipped his arrows in poison before they left his bow. Throughout his whole Discourse indeed, as here, Elihu shews a conspicuous moderation and good sense, at the farthest remove from the bitter injustice of the Friends—a point which surely must have been overlooked by the critics who are so hard on him: he is the fairest and most just-minded of controversialists; instead of evading the main argument of his antagonist to pounce with delight on his occasional slips and exaggerations, and tearing them to tatters with an air of triumph when no real victory has been won, he declines to press any such accident of debate, deals only with what is essential, and bends his assault

only on those main positions which Job was prepared to defend.

It was natural, therefore, that, with all his reverence for Job, he should be offended by the heat and passion of his words, by the absence of moderation and selfrestraint, and tell him that "this strained passion did him wrong." No doubt it is easier for his friend on the bank to maintain his composure than it is for the man who has been swept away by the stream of calamity, and is doing instant battle with its fierce currents and driving waves. Job is not to be overmuch blamed if, under the stress of calamity, and stung by the baseless calumnies of the Friends, he now and then lost composure, and grew immoderate both in his resentments and his retorts. Remembering the keen and protracted agony he had to endure, we may well pardon an offence for which it is so easy to account; we may cheerfully admit, as Jehovah Himself admitted, that in the main he spoke of God aright; we may even admire the constancy and patience with which on the whole he met the provocations and insults of the Friends: and yet we cannot but feel that he often pushed his inferences against the Divine Justice and Providence much too far, as indeed he himself confessed that he had when at last he saw Jehovah face to face, and carried his just resentment against the Friends to excess. There are points in the progress of the story where, as we have seen, he seems to revel in his sense of wrong, and to lash out wildly against both God and man. With fine moral tact Elihu had detected this fault in his tone and bearing, and had discovered whither it was leading him. Hence he cries (Verses 7 and 8): "Where in the world is there a man

like Job, who drinks down scorn like water, and, by meeting scorn with deeper scorn, by nursing his resentment, by fanning it to a white heat, is going over to the ranks of them that do evil, and associating himself with wicked men?"

In proof that, in his fierce passionate resentment of his wrongs. Job was taking the tone and adopting the principles characteristic of the ungodly, and even advancing the sceptical arguments against the Divine Government of the world by which they often sought to justify their impiety and immorality, Elihu charges him (Verse 9) with having contended that "it profiteth a man nothing that he should delight himself in God." that the righteous man has no advantage over the unrighteous. And though Job nowhere uses these very words, he often uses words in which this charge is implied, and even words which state it much more harshly and crudely. What else does he mean by his constant affirmation that, although he is innocent, he is treated as if he were guilty; that, though he is "without transgression," even harder measure is meted out to him than to habitual and notorious transgressors of the Divine law? In Chapter xxi. he formally argues that the wicked live on, wax old, and become mighty in power, in houses "free from fear" and abounding in wealth and happiness; that, after "wearing away their days in mirth," they are blessed with a sudden and painless death, although they say:

What is the Almighty, that we should serve Him, And what will it profit us if we make our suit unto Him?

While in Chapter ix., Verses 22 and 23, he brings the

¹ In this paraphrase I have been able, I hope, to give the real sense of Verses 7 and 8 more exactly than it is possible to give it in any mere translation.

express charge against God which Elihu attributes to him in a form much more offensive than that which Elihu puts into his mouth:

It is all one, therefore will I say it;
The guiltless and the guilty He destroyeth alike;
When the scourge slayeth suddenly,
He laughs at the temptation of the innocent.

There is, as we saw in studying these and kindred passages, much to excuse, much to account for, much even, when once we remember that Job is *conducting an argument*, to vindicate his use of such language as this: and yet who does not perceive, with Elihu, that in using it Job was perilously near to "walking in the counsel of the ungodly, and standing in the way of sinners, and sitting in the seat of the scornful"?

To Elihu such a conclusion as that to which Job seemed at least to have been tending was intolerable, absurd in reason, immoral in its practical influence. And hence, in Verses 10 and 11, he meets it point blank, stating as the thesis or proposition he was prepared to maintain against all comers, that God is not indifferent to the moral complexion of human conduct, that He is of an exact and invariable justice; and that, because He is just, He requites every man according to his deeds—a law the universal incidence of which Job had questioned again and again: and from his thesis, if only he can prove it, Elihu would have us infer that, so far from profiting nothing, a man is and must be the better for his piety, that it must and does profit a man much that he should delight himself in the Almighty.

He opens his statement by a fresh appeal to the sages—the "men of understanding" and the "men of

heart"—whom he saw around him, i.e., men who had long brooded in their hearts over the mysteries of the Divine Providence, as these had been brought home to them by experience and observation, men who had "a feeling sense" of those sacred and often insoluble mysteries. Then, his whole moral nature revolting from the conclusion of evildoers, which Job had adopted or seemed to adopt, he breaks into a formula of indignant deprecation, as one to whom the bare thought of any stain on the fair and sacred Name of God was altogether intolerable:

Far be iniquity from God, And injustice from the Almighty!

And, finally, having first stated his theme in the emotional manner of the East, he states it in the more simple and direct form with which we of the West are familiar:

He requite the every man according to his deed, And according to his work He recompenseth him.

Now this law of exact and universal retribution—of which we have already heard so much from the Friends—has always been held by men of experience and faith to be the ruling law of the Divine Providence; and even those who do not admit that it is, at least admit that it should be so. It rests on a natural instinct and craving; for who is not ready to demand?—

Let sin, alone committed, light alone Upon his head that hath transgressed so; Let guiltless souls be freed from guilty woe.

The Friends held that this was the law, and by their pungent, personal, and mistaken applications of it had well-nigh driven Job to despair. Job held that it

ought to be the law, but questioned and doubted whether it was. Elihu, first giving a wider scope to the law, is about to contend, against Job, that what ought to be must be and is. And even the most advanced thinkers of modern times, when they too have given the law a still larger interpretation and wider scope than Elihu's, maintain with him that Retribution is the true key to the Providence which shapes men's ends for them, or, if they do not recognize a Divine Providence, that it is the true and scientific key to the life of man upon the earth. To us, therefore, the arguments by which Elihu sustains his proposition can hardly fail to be as interesting as they were to the "men of understanding" to whom they were originally addressed.

In his first argument (Verses 12-15) he takes the high a priori road, and contends, philosophically enough, that God cannot be inequitable, because He has no reason, no conceivable motive, for inequity. It is not as if the government of the world had been imposed upon Him from without, a task reluctantly undertaken, which, therefore, He might be disposed to neglect; nor is it as if He had been entrusted with it for a time by some superior Power, and might, therefore, be tempted, like some greedy satrap, to "wrest justice," in order to enrich Himself at the expense of his subjects (Verse 13). On the contrary, it was of his own will that He made the earth and called men into being. It can only be because He loves them that He either created or sustains them. Were He intent on Himself alone, impelled by any selfish or selfregarding motive, impelled by aught save an unselfish and everlasting love, He would recall the quickening

and sustaining emanations of his Divine energy; and, withdrawing from us both the breath of our nostrils and that spiritual influence which is to the soul what the breath is to the body, He would suffer all flesh to "expire together," and the whole frame of man to crumble into dust (*I cross* 14, 15). As it is and can be no self-regarding affection, no desire for self-aggrandizement, which induces Him to vivify us by a constant impartation of his "spirit" and to uphold us in being by a constant exertion of his power, what possible motive can He have for perverting justice and for treating us inequitably?

And, indeed, if we believe in a Creator at all, and especially in a Creator whose power is the servant of his love, I do not see how we are to answer that question, how we are to evade the force of Elihu's first argument; for surely He who made and sustains us of his own will, at the mere prompting of love, is not likely to act unjustly by us.

But Elihu has another argument to urge in support of his thesis (Verses 16 19), and an argument of the same philosophical character as the first. Like St. Paul (Romans iii. 6), he contends that He who rules the world cannot be unjust, since injustice undermines authority, and eventually overthrows it. Opening with a new appeal to the wise and experienced men in the circle of bystanders (Verse 16), he affirms that there would be a kind of treason in charging even earthly kings and princes with injustice, since that would be to deny them the very quality most essential to their high difficult function; and to deny them the quality without which they were unfit to reign would be virtually to depose them (Verse 18).

But if it be a kind of treason to accuse them of injustice, what must it be to launch the self-same accusation against Him by whom alone kings reign and princes decree justice? If no man who "hates justice" has any right to rule, or any ability for rule, how much more incredible and impossible is it that the Omnipotent should be unjust, or that He in whom power and justice must be one should wrest the cause of those who come before Him (Verse 17)? And, again (Verse 19), what motive can He have for injustice who made both the noble and the beggar, both rich and poor, to whom, therefore, all are equally dear? If all men are "the work of his hands," and all they have be his gift, why should He prefer one before another, and so prefer the one as to wrong the other, thus putting his very throne in jeopardy by bringing a stain upon his justice?

Granting Elihu's premiss, granting that God is omnipotent, it is impossible to disprove his conclusion, that God is and must be just. And hence it is that in our own day those who question the justice of God also question his might, and infer that the action of his pure and benevolent Will is checked and thwarted by some dark Power equal, if not superior, to his own.

But Elihu is not content with mere logic and philosophic inference; he appeals to facts. Having shewn what must be, he passes on to what is. He appeals to history (Verses 20–30) in support of his philosophy, and contends with Milton that

For a time injustice may thrive, or seem to thrive; the wicked may be in great power and swell like a

green bay tree; but from the first the axe is laid at the root of every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, and sooner or later the axe is lifted and the tree falls. The Divine Ruler of the world may suffer tyrannic authority to play its "fantastic tricks" unrebuked for a while; and that base multitude which is ever ready to acclaim high-handed assertions of power that seem to subserve national or "imperial" interests, fooled by impunity, may lose all sense of moral distinctions; but, when the cup of their iniquity is full, rich and poor, mighty and feeble, despotic princes and their base subservient flatterers and accomplices, are overthrown and perish as in a moment: in the culminating hour of darkness the dawn of a new day strikes upward into the sky; and the mighty who, by their injustice, have grown intolerable to God and man, are "taken off" the swelling stage "without hand," as it were, that is, by a hand not visible to them, by a force the very existence of which they have not foreboded or have not respected (Verse 20). This "unseen hand" may stand for the resentment of the honest and the just who, patient of wrong up to a certain point, suddenly and unexpectedly rise up against it when it passes all bounds of endurance; or it may point to the dark and sudden conspiracies, the palace intrigues, by which, especially in the East, those who stand round the throne execute a wild justice on the tyrant who has outraged all justice: or, as is more likely from the whole tone of the passage, it may indicate the immediate hand, the instant judgment, of an offended God. What Elihu means is, most probably, that "in the middle of the night," when the darkness is at the deepest and injustice is becoming the law, those

who have darkened the lives of so many of their fellows are removed—like Pharaoh, like Herod—by the invisible and immediate stroke of Divine Justice, "the people" who approved of them, or even tolerated them, often sharing their doom or suffering from their fall.

For from the following Verses it is very evident that at this point he has God in his thoughts. Human judges may be unjust even when most intent on justice; they cannot know all the ways of man or trace "all his steps;" and if they could acquaint themselves with all his deeds, they could not penetrate to the motives which inspired them and gave them their ethical colour and significance. Impartial verdicts are not likely to proceed from partial knowledge. But the knowledge of the Supreme Ruler of men is not partial; He is omniscient, and his omniscience is a new argument and guarantee of his impartiality. His eyes are ever on the ways of men; He beholds all their steps (Verse 21). Nothing can escape his gaze; no dark shadow, no plausible subterfuge, can hide from Him the offender's guilt (Verse 22). Knowing men altogether, familiar with their motives as well as their deeds, with the whole complexion of their nature and life as well as with the separate actions for which they may be called to account, there is no need for Him to hold such a judicial investigation as Job had again and again demanded (Cf. Chap. xxiv. 1, ct seq.), no need even for Him "to look at a man twice," before pronouncing sentence or executing judgment (Verse 23). Without an inquisition, therefore (Verse 24), which would add nothing to his knowledge, the Allseeing Judge hurls the unjust, however

mighty, from their pride of place, and sets up "others," i.c., more worthy and equitable rulers, in their steadall the rebellions, revolutions, and reformations of the various races of the world being ruled and determined by God in so far as they spring from a just resentment of injustice and vice. He who knows these unjust rulers altogether, whatever the darkness in which they strive to hide themselves, if at times He smites them in the guarded seclusion in which they have entrenched themselves against the victims of their despotic humours, snatching them thence or crushing them in it as with an unseen hand (Verse 25; comp. Verse 20), at other times strikes them "in the open sight of all "-" in the place of the spectators," the public haunt where men most congregate; i.c., they are openly punished for their secret sins by Him who seeth in secret, punished by the manifest judgment of Heaven, by the immediate "visitation of God" (Verse 26).

That he may still further impress his hearers, the spectators of the tragedy of which the *mezbele* was the open and exposed stage, with a sense of the Divine Justice, and of the Love that lies at the very heart of that Justice, Elihu proceeds to emphasize the fact he has already affirmed, that the judgments of God are based on purely moral distinctions, and are intended to uphold the moral sanctions of a law which must be enforced if the broad realm over which He rules is to be happy and at peace. It is because men, and especially men dressed in a little brief authority, are wicked (*Verse* 26), because they are lawless and godless (*Verse* 27), that He strikes them down in the presence of those whom they have wronged and cor-

rupted and oppressed. Little as they meant to set such a cause in motion, it is their fraud and injustice and cruelty which have compelled God to intervene, since it is these which have "caused the cry" of the poor sufferers by them to go up before One who never turns a deaf or indifferent ear to their cry (Verse 28: comp. Exodus ii. 23, 24; and James v. 4). As it is his consideration, his compassion, for the poor and the afflicted which moves Him to give them peace by "crushing" the tyrants who troubled their peace, who can condemn Him as though He were unjust? And if He hide his face from men in displeasure at their crimes and sins, who can "behold" Him? who, that is, can penetrate the veil with which He has covered his face and turn his displeasure into favour? Whether his judgment fall only on the tyrant who has provoked it by his sins against the public welfare, or also embrace in its wide dark folds the guilty nation which by its sympathy or easy toleration has become a partaker in his sins, is it not just that He should bring the triumph of the wicked to an end, and not suffer men to be netted and ensnared, as they are only too apt to be, by the spectacle of wickedness triumphing in high places (Verses 29, 30)?

What were the special historical catastrophes that Elihu had in his mind, and on which he based his induction of the justice of the Divine Rule, we do not know; but every age abounds in them, and it is quite obvious that they were as familiar and as impressive to Job himself ¹ as they were to Elihu: to both they were the most striking and weighty proofs of the equitable and kindly Providence which shapes men's

¹ See Chap. xxiv. 2-25; and Chap. xxvii. 13-23.

lives and ends for them, mishew them how they will. And we need not pause to quote instances before admiring the firm grasp of ethical principles displayed by this wise Young Man. He saw clearly what all the added history of thirty or forty centuries, so rich in examples of the Justice that rules the world, has not even yet taught some among us that the moral principles by which we acknowledge we are bound to govern our individual lives apply no less to the lives and actions of nations: that the same laws, enforced by the same awful sanctions, hold in both, and ultimately govern both; that lies, however diplomatic, frauds on however large a scale, and a tyrannous use of superior strength, are as contemptible, and in the end as fatal, in a nation as in a man. And he had also learned, what some of us are still slow to see, that the goal and end of all Divine judgments is mercy; that God strikes down the lawless oppressor, whether of the family or of the nation, from love to the oppressed, and brings successful evil to a sudden end out of compassion for the unthinking multitude who might be dazzled and corrupted by it were its triumph to endure.

Having advanced these able and cogent arguments for the justice of the Lord and Governor of the world, Elihu goes on to infer his conclusion from them and to point the moral of them (Verses 31–37). He had already prepared the way for his application by the phrase (Verse 29), "Whether he hideth his face from a nation or only from a man;" for obviously the "man" he had in his eye was none other than Job. To Job, therefore, he now applies the argument he has conducted to a close. There may be another link of connection between this hortatory conclusion and the

Verses which immediately precede it. Possibly, as some Commentators hold, Elihu meant to imply a hint that even the haughty and lawless tyrants, who had provoked the judgments of God by their egregious and multiplied crimes, would not have sought his face in vain had they sought it in the way of penitence and amendment. But though these subtle and delicate links of connection lend an added charm to the Poem. we do not need to trace them out in order to vindicate the conclusion he draws from his great argument. For if, as he has argued, God's rule of man is characterized by an invariable justice, and even this justice is but a form of his love, what else is there for any sufferer to do but to humble himself under the mighty but tender Hand that has been laid upon him, to infer that at the best he has been guilty of sins of ignorance, to brace himself to bear with patience the inevitable results of his sins, and to seek a wider knowledge of the Law by which his life is governed? This is the only course open to him, and becoming to him; for how can a man reasonably rebel against the decrees of Justice and Love? And this is the course, so Elihu implies, which 70b ought to have taken, instead of flaming out into impeachments of the Divine equity and kindness.

In the hope that he may still take this course, Elihu offers him (*Verses* 31, 32) a model confession, shews him how the true penitent draws near to the Heavenly Majesty, and leaves him to compare with this "meet" saying his own passionate invectives and self-justifying appeals. Through the heavy pauses and broken constructions of this Confession we are intended, I suppose, to hear the sobs and groans of the Penitent, who, since he cannot and will not impugn the justice of God, can

only infer that, consciously or unconsciously, he has transgressed the Divine order, broken the Divine law. Such an one can appeal to the Great Searcher of hearts, who knows his inward thoughts and motives as well as all his deeds, and say: "I have borne;" i.e., though, his breath failing him for sorrow and his voice lost in the sighings of his contrition, he does not tell us what he has endured-" I both have borne and will bear my chastisement as patiently as I can, since it comes to correct my offence:" "I will not offend;" i.e., though he does not or cannot complete his phrase, "I will not offend any more:" and, lest he should once more and unwittingly offend, " That which I see not, teach Thou me, that, if I have done wrong, I may do it no more." In the main this patient endurance of chastening, this resolve to amend, and this craving for a larger and clearer knowledge of the law that has to be kept under such stern penalties, are the very stuff and substance of all true repentance, and we may very well accept Elihu's form—as he evidently intended us to accept it -as a model confession. At the same time, the conditional phrase, "if I have done wrong," shews clearly enough that Elihu had Job in his mind, and modified his model so as to adapt it to the peculiarities, or supposed peculiarities, of the case before him. Job had contended that he had not wittingly or wilfully transgressed the Divine law. "Not wittingly, perhaps," suggests Elihu, "nor wilfully; but may you not unconsciously, and without intention, have transgressed a law which must hold on its course and exact its penalties of all who transgress it, however innocent of evil intention they may be? Nay, must you not, if, as I have shewn, God be just?" The whole implication of the passage is

that there may be sins of ignorance as well as sins of intention—unintended transgressions which entail suffering even though they do not involve guilt; and that it is for the good of the world at large that even these transgressions should receive their due recompense.

Thus he reconciles the integrity of Job with the justice of God, or at least hints at a possible reconciliation, and shews Job how, even on his own hypothesis, instead of charging the Ruler of the world with injustice, he should draw near to Him in penitence and

supplication.

Innocent of any sins, or of any conscious sins, which demanded the special judgments that had fallen on him, Job might be: nevertheless, he was not without sin. For (Verse 33) he had dared to judge, and even to condemn, the Judge of all; and who could do that without guilt? He had quarrelled with the Divine order of the world, and preferred to it another order of his own invention and choice. Was he to impose his law and order on God, or God to impose his on him?

Such I take to be the meaning of this very difficult Verse; but some critics worthy of all respect take it to mean that, if Job is not content with the Divine order, it is for him to decide whether or not he will still adhere to his own conception of what ought to be, not for Elihu, since he, Elihu, is quite content with what is, and has no desire to see the existing order changed. This interpretation rests on the fact that the final words of the Verse, which I have rendered, "but not He," mean, literally, "and not I." But I would submit that we have here only that emphatic Hebrew idiom of which many instances are to be found in the Old Testament—e.g., Ecclesiastes ii. 25, and iv. 8—the

speaker projecting himself for a moment into the place of God and speaking thence. Both the logic and tone of the passage, I think, make the rendering I have preferred the more natural one.

But however that may be, and whatever Job may think, whatever decision he may arrive at, Elihu will be glad to hear it; and hence he turns upon Job with the demand, "Say, speak out, what thou knowest," not without some hope probably that Job may avail himself of the loophole of escape which he has provided for him in Verse 32, and adopt a Confession which does not necessarily impeach the integrity which he was so resolute to maintain; nor without hope that Job may see the absurdity of demanding that the King of the universe should take a law from the mouth of his subject. Even to this appeal, however, Job remains dumb, much, I suspect, to Elihu's grief and disappointment. But though Job will make no concession, Elihu is quite sure—perhaps he saw assent to his argument and conclusion in their faces and bearing -that the wise and experienced onlookers, to whom he now reverts, will admit that, in charging the Ruler of the world with injustice, Job had sinned against his own better knowledge and had failed to shew his usual wisdom (Verses 34, 35). And since even yet Job will not confess and abandon his sin, Elihu has no alternative but to hope that he may still be probed and proved, "proved to the uttermost," until by the severities of his probation he has been purged from the folly which had led him to speak "like the wicked" (Verse 36; comp. Verses 7-9). His original offence was aggravated by his obstinate adherence to it, by his refusal to take the attitude and utter the confession of the

Penitent (*Verse* 37). By cherishing a self-justifying and impenitent spirit he was adding "mutiny," or rebellion, to his "sin," wilful to unconscious guilt—adding *pesha* to *chattath*. "All sorts of sins, acts of weakness, negligence, or carelessness, are implied in the primary expression *chattath*; but sins of design and violent

purpose are specially implied by pesha."

There may be some touch of wounded self-love, as well as of disappointment, in the charge with which Elihu concludes his second Discourse. Undoubtedly it was hard on him that an argument so able and cogent, so philosophical in tone, and closing with an induction from historical facts which he may well have thought Job would feel to be irresistible, should have failed to produce conviction or any sign of assent. And yet, though our sympathies go with Job more than with Elihu, who can deny that, at bottom, and bating some unnecessary heat of tone, the charge was true? Not Job himself, we may be sure. For when Jehovah repeats Elihu's charge (Comp. Chap. xxxiv. 35 with Chap. xlii. 3), Job humbly confesses that he had "spoken without knowledge," retracts all the accusations against the Divine Justice in which he had associated himself with the wicked; and not only repents with the gentle and hopeful contrition which Elihu had advised, but "abhors himself" for his guilt, and repents "in dust and ashes"—as impassioned and vehement in his very penitence before God as he had been in "multiplying words against God."

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER III.

Verse 1.-We have already remarked one strange and solemn peculiarity of the prophetic outlook. For the most part, God's prophets anticipate darkness and judgment, apostasy and its doom. The most spiritual of men have seen in the aspects of their own days the hints and forecast of a sadder future. In one of the earliest of St. Paul's letters he prophesied the coming of Antichrist, though he foresaw his discomfiture and ultimate destruction. The heavens had not brightened over St. Paul, nor had the earthly prospects of the kingdom of righteousness become more hopeful when he penned his last letter. The Church itself contained, from the first, elements of evil, explosive forces, antagonistic and deteriorating agencies, which portended evil. The fifth Verse of the Chapter before us shews that the calamitous influences, the humiliating characteristics, and impracticable persons from whom such dire consequences might be anticipated were already sufficiently conspicuous to put Timothy on his guard. This consideration must govern our translation of such a phrase as "the last days." Many passages may be quoted from the Old Testament in which the writers meant by the Hebrew phrase, which is thus rendered in LXX. nothing more than "the future," the "hereafter" of Israel, according as it revealed itself to the prophetic glance of Jacob, Balaam, or Moses. 1 But in other passages 2 the same phrase has acquired the

Gen. xlix. 1; Numb. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30.

² Isaiah ii. 2; Hosea iii. 5; Micah iv. 1, &c.

special technical meaning of "the period," or the "dispensation of the Messiah," and in the New Testament it is often used to denote any portion of that period. With the exception of the references to the last day (ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα) in John vi., where that day is associated (as in John xi. 24) with the resurrection of the dead, the phrase is employed to denote the whole period of the Messiah. The Jews 1 spoke of "the present age," and of the "world to come," the former referring to the Mosaic, and the latter to the Messianic, dispensation. 2 During the entire Mosaic and Judaic dispensation the Jews understood by the "coming age" the whole Messianic period. This rabbinical and postbiblical usage passed to a certain extent into the vocabulary of the New Testament. Living, as the Apostles did, in the Messianic age, they naturally discriminated between what was the present to them and what was still future. The συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, although to occur in the "last days," on which they had entered, was yet in the future, and would be accompanied by the epiphany of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, 3 and eternal judgment.

Thus the less definite phrase used in I Timothy iv. I (ὑστέροις καιροῖς) contemplates a time which, though giving signs of its advent, is yet future to the writer. This, again, slightly differs from "the last time" in I Peter i. 5 and Jude v. 18, a phrase by which the writer clearly means the climax of the kingdom of God. There are numerous proofs that the Apostles

¹ Wahl and Bretschneider differ from Buxtorf about the universality of the usage among the Rabbins. See Stuart, *Comm. Heb.* i. 1.

² 'Ο αίων ὁ ἐνεστως, ὁ αίων ὁ μέλλων, ἔσχαται ἡμέραι, and ἔσχατον ἡμερων appear to be used in nearly the same signification.

³ See an interesting article in Cremer's Lexicon, p. 74, ff.

felt they were living in the closing dispensation of Divine grace, and that all things were hurrying forward to their consummation. "In these last days" Timothy's lot was cast, although the horizon would widen as he pressed forward into life and service; and St. Paul says, "Know this, that difficult (grievous, or perilous) seasons will set in—will become present. The instabunt of the Vulgate and aderunt of Bengel represent the idea.

The Gospel is not the cause of these calamities, but the sufferer from them. Evils like those which the Apostle proceeds to describe will shelter themselves under the form of godliness. There are earlier and later "seasons" and "a last time" "among the last days" of the world which had already dawned. For men (the article before men in the Greek text gives great generality to the statement) will be lovers of self. This word, peculiar to the Epistle, describes the root-principle of all sin. St. Paul anticipates in the kingdom of Christ, or in close contact with it, the Antichrist, the radix of all antagonism to the will of God. In the "upper chamber" there were cowards and traitors who loved themselves more than their Master; and the selfishness of fear and of greed disgraced the primitive community of the faithful. "Lovers of self" have played a great part in the Church as well as in the world, from the days of the Apostles to our own. Selflove leads by a certain evolution to avarice; and St. Paul adds, covetous persons will abound. See on φιλαργυρία, I Timothy vi. 10, where self-love in the form of the love of money, or avarice, or eager desire for the means of subsistence or pleasure, is declared to be "a root of

¹ Cf. Heb. ii. 5—την οἰκουμένην την μέλλουσαν," "the world that was to be."

all evils." Swaggerers, haughty, i.e., arrogant, striving to appear of more importance than they are, shewing themselves as above their neighbours, blasphemers or "slanderers." Blasphemy does not necessarily mean contumelious speech concerning God, though it often means more than the slander of a neighbour or brother man. Blasphemous words against Almighty God are a natural outgrowth of arrogant self-consideration. "I knew thee," said the wicked and slothful servant, "that thou wert a hard man," &c. Paul expected the new revelation not to pass unchallenged, and that it might provoke malicious slander of God Himself. Disobedient to parents, a vice condemned by Greek, Roman, and Chinese moralists, and one of the corruptions of humanity referred to in Romans i. 30.2 Another hint is given concerning the extravagant individualism to which a perverted Christianity might lead. Unthankful — to God and man; the state of mind which eats out the spirit of prayer 3 and all the grace of mutual love. Profane—this word 4 occurs in the New Testament only in 1 Timothy i. 9, and in this verse; and it means lack of conformity with all Divine regulations, trifling with all sacred associations, possibly through moral enmity against God.

Verse 3.—Without natural affection, destitute of the

r See Archbishop Trench, Synonyms, § xxix. 'Λλαζών is boastful in words, swaggering; $\dot{\nu}\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\eta}\phi\alpha\nu\sigma\varsigma$, proud, and arrogant in thought; $\dot{\nu}\beta\rho\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$, insolent in action. The second word is associated, Esther iv. 10, LXX., with $\dot{\phi}\iota\lambda o\delta\sigma\dot{\xi}\dot{\iota}\alpha$.

² 'Αλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι are all found in the catalogue of the sins of the heathen world (Rom. i.).
³ Phil. iv. 6.

^{4 &#}x27;Ανόσιος, which is associated with $\beta \epsilon \beta \dot{\eta} \lambda o_{\rm g}$ in 1 Tim. i. 9. Ellicott takes it to mean a lack of inward purity. It contradicts ὅσιος, a word which in classical Greek means conformity with law, human and Divine, and also conformity with honoured usage. It rises in dignity in LXX., though it is seldom used by New Testament writers. 'Ανόσιος is used in Ezek. xxii. 9 of an unburied corpse. Cf. Plato, Euthyphron, 9: ὁ ἄν πάντες οἱ θεοὶ μισῶσιν ἀνόσιον.

emotion, which binds by strong instinct children to parents, and parents to children, brothers to sisters, and the like. This word is not used in good writers for sensual or sexual passion. The absence of natural affection is a revolting accompaniment of some forms of heathenism. Infanticide, and the exposure of parents, and many of the customs of the most enlightened nations of the ancient world, might and would invade even the precincts of the kingdom of God. Implacable, those who will not make a truce of any kind, or come to any understanding, with friend or opponent. Another exaggeration of selfwilled individualism. False accusers (very devils). Mack says that "blasphemers" are those who speak injuriously to your face, "accusers" are those who slander you behind your back-malicious faultfinders; destitute of self-control 2 in the broadest sense—licentious, incontinent, and dissipated. Savage, a word which Chrysostom and Œcumenius both define as characterized by rawness, unripeness, and cruelty, the conduct of wild beasts, without any love to what is good.3 They have cropped up in every age. We have heard of men to whom the profession of principle, the claims of righteousness, the beauty of goodness, holy conduct and character, are like a red rag to a mad bull. They deliberately admire self-assertion, and put personal interests before humanity, justice, or the fear of God.

Verse 4.—Traitors, betrayers of their brethren—an anticipation of the diabolical cruelty of some converts

¹ 'Ασύνθετος, according to Hesychius, is one who will not abide by a contract; ἀσπονδος, one who will not make one. The latter word is here used.

² Another $\ddot{a}\pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma$. 'Aκρατεῖς is the very opposite to ἐγκρατεῖς. ³ Φιλάγαθος occurs in Tit. i. 8; the negative form is $\ddot{a}\pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma$.

to Christianity, who, in different persecutions, betrayed each other to captivity and death. I Precipitate (headstrong, literally, falling forward), hasty in speech, thought, and action. This epithet by itself might seem an anticlimax, but coming after the long enumeration of evil characteristics, gives intensity to them all. Besotted, moreover, beclouded with pride—a word generally associated with ignorance, madness, and lack of sense. Lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God. Both compounds are peculiar to this passage in the New Testament, though found in Philo. The uttermost abomination in St. Paul's mind is to make a god of the "belly, and to glory in one's shame" (Phil. iii. 19); and this last touch is explanatory of very much already hinted at. The love of pleasure amounting to an idolatry, will lead its subject to sacrifice the happiness of others, and every higher interest whatsoever, to secure pleasure. The hideous records of licentiousness and avarice, of drunkenness and narcotism, will show how the last description may in some sense be seen to embrace and stimulate all that has preceded.

Verse 5.—The worst and most revolting prospect appears in the statement that such as these are not altogether outside of the visible kingdom, but that they actually make the profession of faith in Christ. Having a form 2 of godliness—affecting, that is, the possession of some of the essential characteristics of true piety. They make a profession of godliness, not only by wearing its garb, or its external form, but by

¹ See Synodical letter containing canons attributed to Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea. Ante-Nicene Lib. vol. xx. p. 33.

 $^{^{2}}$ Μορφή has been admirably distinguished by Bishop Lightfoot from $\sigma \chi \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ in his notes to the Epistle to Philippians, pp. 125-131. Wiesinger thinks that $\mu \dot{\phi} \rho \phi \omega \sigma \iota g$ is antithetic to the substance of godliness.

cherishing the motives of piety, and even by sharing a certain kind of Christian experience; but denying the power of it. Conduct and character such as that which St. Paul believes possible even among professors of godliness, utterly repudiate its true power. Their life is a divorce between ideas and their legitimate effects, a practical negation of the meaning of redemption. "Power" inheres in "godliness," but such conduct proclaims a bold denial of the fact. The base professor lies. Profligate repudiation of the importance of conduct proves that those who practise it know better. This terrible hint reveals the effect upon the Churches of Asia Minor of the entrance in among them of "grievous wolves." The passage implies that a form of heathen Christianity would be heard of which was antinomian and impure, which tampered with vice, and left character and habit unchanged, which, with the name of Christ upon the lip, in song, in prayer, and salutation, would boldly advocate the utmost license. The history of the Church has provided ghastly repetitions of those portentous forms of unnatural alliance between the honour due to Christ and the indulgence of selfish and sensual passion, which produced disastrous consequences from the first. The particular sins that have been regarded as venial have materially differed with successive generations. with the fashion or tradition of the hour, with dominant temptations and physical temperament. At one place and time lust, and at another time and place cruelty or arrogance, unrighteousness or avarice, falsehood or hardness, cowardice or cant, have been actually favoured, protected, or excused by those who doubtless had the form of godliness, but thus denied

its power. And from these turn away. Already symptoms of the evil had manifested themselves. Admonition, remonstrance, or further trial would be alike useless. No hope remained for such as these: Timothy is to cease from all communication with them.

Verses 6, 7 .- For of these, of this very class, the Apostle proceeds to give a startling specimen—are they who creep 2 (stealthily, by underhand ways, enter) into houses and make captives 3 of silly women, 4 not worn-out jades, but small-souled women, impressionable, susceptible of religious excitement, eager for some kind of relief from their ennui. They are not the highborn ladies affected by the Gnostic heresiarchs, but women burdened with sins, i.e., whose sins are heaped up as a heavy burden on their heart and memory; led along by various kinds of lusts, not by sensuality only, but by frivolity, by impatience of control, by their sense of burden, and thus ready for any fresh combination, any wild proposition to break the monotony of their existence; always learning, willing to get hold of some ideas, some "form of piety," yet by their evil propensions never possessing the power, never at any time able to arrive at a full recognition or acknowledgment of the truth. This last clause seems to me to discountenance rather than justify the passage from Jerome

² Ἐνδύνω generally means to enter, or put on; and we have it in the latter sense in New Testament, Matt. vi. 25; 2 Cor. v. 3; but a few instances are quoted from the classics in which a furtive entrance is suggested by the word = hineinschlupfen, thus Herod. ii. 121; Aristp. Vespæ, 1020. Plato and Arist. are referred to by Rost and Palm.

 $^{^3}$ Αἰχμαλωτίζοντες: cf. Luke xxi. 24; Rom. vii. 23. The ordinary Attic form is αἰχμαλωτον ποιεῖν, cf. Ignat. ad. Philad. c. 2.

^{4 &}quot;Little women," nulierculas. The term is one of reproach, or rather of contempt.

(quoted by Oosterzee, Huther, and others) in which he draws up a long list of the heresiarchs from Simon Magus to Arius, who found female proselytes and companions not only contribute to their pleasures, but to their influence over others. The charge might be, and was, retorted on orthodox bishops, and even upon the monk of Bethlehem. Baur has of course seen in this passage the hint of its later origin, and of second century Gnosticism. The argument, however, breaks down, because (1) sufficient proof can be given that before the death of the Apostles Simon Magus had been distinguished by his influence over Helena; (2) because these Asiatic Churches were condemned (in Apocalypse, chap. ii. 2, 6, 19, 20) for the Nicolaitanism and Balaamitism which they had suffered, and which the Lord hated; and (3) because in all probability St. Paul had quite enough of this kind of evil under his own eye to lead him to put Timothy on his guard against its pernicious tendency. If the characteristics described above were beginning to reveal themselves, the helpless, heedless, sinful, uneducated, unteachable women thus referred to would easily be made a prey by designing men, who were trading on their weaknesses.

Verses 8, 9.—As the Egyptian magicians, Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses by imitating and aping his noblest miracles, by using their knowledge of magic and legerdemain, and by utilizing the science and incantation of Egypt, effected a parody upon, and a refutation of, the Divine commission of Moses, so these men by feigning analogous facts, and boasting Divine authority, also resist or withstand the truth. Just as the sorcerer Elymas endeavoured to turn away Sergius Paulus from the faith of Christ (Acts xiii. 8), so

similar efforts would be made again. The reference to the names of Jannes and Jambres is startling and unlike Paul's more ordinary style. Still we find independent and abundant evidence of Paul's rabbinical training and familiarity with the traditional teaching of the fathers of his nation. Therefore if he read the contemporary Targums, and was acquainted at all with the oral teaching subsequently embodied in the Talmud, the difficulty vanishes. The names of these magicians do not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, but with certain variants I they repeatedly appear in the Talmud. They are mentioned in the Chaldee paraphrase of Exodus i. 15 with a story—how Pharaoh dreamed that all the land of Egypt was weighed in the balances against one little lamb; and how he called his magicians and wise men together to interpret the mystery; and how Fonis and Fimbres, chief of the magicians, said "an infant will be born in the congregation of Israel by which all the land of Egypt will be laid waste." In the paraphrase of Exodus vii. 11, the magicians are designated by very similar names, and a Hebrew commentary on the passage declares them to have been disciples (the Talmud says sons) of Balaam, the great soothsayer, and that the two men who followed him on his way from Midian to Balak king of Moab, 2 were none other than Jonis and Jimbres. Mr. R. S. Poole believes that he has found the Egyptian origin of one at least of the names. Eusebius (Prap. Ev. ix. 8) preserves a passage from Numenius,3 a Neo-Pythagorean, in which both names

יואני, יוחנא, ינים ' Cf. Syriac New Testament, which gives Yonis and Yanbris.

² Cf. Lightfoot's Erubhin, c. 24; Wettstein and Heydenreich in loco; Winer's Realwörterbuch, i. 534.

³ In his work περὶ τάγαθοῦ.

are given as those of Egyptian priests; and Origen refers to Numenius and his acquaintance with these names in praise of his intimate study of our books. Theodoret says that the Apostle was acquainted with the unwritten teaching of the Jews, and so not only became acquainted with the tradition, but thus put the sanction of inspiration upon it. This is a position which Bishop Ellicott seems to approve, though it suggests a doubtful theory of Divine inspiration. It is enough that proof exists that these names were given to the Egyptian magicians.²

As Fannes and Fambres withstood Moses, so these also withstand truth—men of corrupt minds, men whose intellectual and moral nature was itself basely corrupted, the very light within them having become darkness, unapproved of (reprobi, reprobate) in the matter of faith, unable to stand its moral requirements, weighed and found wanting. This sense of the word (αδόκιμοι) is that which frequently appears in Paul's epistles.3 Antagonism to the Gospel has often taken a similar form. The record of the thaumaturgic wonders of a credulous age are now quoted to invalidate the supernatural claims of the Gospel. Spiritualism, mesmerism, and scientific marvels are eagerly pressed by those who reject the evidence which miracles supply to the Divine legation of the Christ. Satire, fiction, poetry, paganism, classical allegories, Hindoo Puranas, Scandinavian Eddas, and solar myths are put in re-

¹ Comm. Matt. contra Celsum, iv. 51.

² Wieseler, in his great article in Herzog's Encyc. Appendix, urges numerous evidences of the presence of Neo-Pythagorean Goëtism in Asia Minor, of which we have proof in the burning of the books at Ephesus at the close of Paul's first ministry there. Thus he accounts for the peculiarities of the false teachers to whom frequent references are made in the Pastoral Epistles.

³ Cf. δοκιμος in chap. ii. 15; Titus i. 16; Rom. i. 28.

quisition to invalidate the unique claims of Christ. The analogues of Jannes and Jambres have often

reappeared, and are busy now.

Verse 9 .- But they shall not advance to more, i.e., to a higher position of influence over human minds. This is not a contradiction to Verse 16 or to Verse 13. The folly of these men may become more conspicuous. Their moral condition and peril will be worse, but their power to withstand the truth will be arrested, for their folly shall be manifested to all, as theirs (that of Jannes and Jambres) also was in the hands of Moses. Christianity survived the literary hostility of Celsus and Porphyry and Julian. It has surmounted the bitter envenomed malice of false friends and open enemies, the deplorable parodies of ecclesiastical miracles and of false religions, and the subtle substitutes made for it in scholasticism and in the logical jugglery of mediæval superstition. It lives on, notwithstanding the cruel accumulation of myth, the hunt for relics, the worship of images, the abuse of ecclesiastical pardons, and the transformation of rhetorical imagery into physical fact. The spiritual triumphs it has won vindicate its own essential worth. The rivalry of the modern vendor of scientific miracles and the boasts of the founders of new religions will pass away like dreams of the night; the outbreak of enthroned reason and maddened pessimism, and the insufferable audacity of some crude solutions of the mysteries of existence, will make "their folly manifest." The triumphs of grace go forward in individual souls; triumphs and marvels occur which only the colour-blind cannot see. One by one the opponents of Christ subside. The Nazarene gains the victory.

Verse 10.—But thou, my dear son Timothy (the

pronoun is emphatic), thou hast been or wert a follower (perhaps a diligent follower, for the word ἀκόλουθος suggests close intimacy) of my doctrine. If the agrist tense be the correct reading instead of the perfect, it implies the possibility of a change of Timothy's sentiment towards the Apostle; but it is quite possible also that the length of time that had elapsed since the grand days of the early intimacies between these two, and even since the later prison fellowship, had begun to fade into the past, and to be looked at as an entire experience. If so, this would justify the aorist, without the faintest suggestion of defalcation of interest, or of implicit rebuke. "Thou wert" in old times, "and," so far as opportunity presents itself, "thou art still a diligent follower of my method, of the form and manner of my instructions." The word διδασκαλία is used almost interchangeably in a subjective sense, for instruction, or method of teaching, and anon in an objective sense for the matter of the teaching or "doctrine." Since all the following terms refer to the subjective and experimental aspects of Paul's apostleship, I think it is well to assume that the first term of the series is of the same kind (so Heydenreich, Fairbairn, &c.) Thou wert a diligent observer of my manner of life,2 of "my ways which are in Christ Jesus," 3 of my purpose too, a word generally used elsewhere by St. Paul to denote God's eternal plan. Here it may refer to the resolute determination with which the Apostle pursued one great aim, or, the well-known aim itself. The Apostle's

² Άγωγή is ἄπ. λεγ. in New Testament, but is found in Esther ii. 20, and is (Hesych.) equivalent to τρόπος or ἀναστροφή.

³ I Cor. iv. 17.

¹ Tischendorf in 8th ed. has given $\pi \alpha \rho \eta \kappa ο λούθη σάς$, although the majority of uncials **%**, A, C, F, G, read $\pi \alpha \rho \eta \kappa ο λούθη κας$. The perfect occurs in 1 Tim. iv. 6, which he supposes may have led to the correction from a orist to perfect here.

grand "regal passion," which dominated his conduct, "his life-long master-thought, the purpose to which everything else gave way," may embrace both the subjective and objective interpretations of πρόθεσις. My faith, not the body of truths I have held, but the trust I have exercised, the confidence in God, the reliance on Christ's love and power which has been the keynote of my life. Observe the close proximity of the terms (μακροθυμία, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή), my long suffering, love, patience, or patient endurance. This is another instance where "patience," the fruit of hope, is made to occupy its place.²

Verse II.—My persecutions, my sufferings such (sufferings) as befel me in Antioch, in Iconium, in Lystra. These sufferings are described in Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 2-19, and were those which induced young Timothy to embrace the religion of Jesus Christ. The stunned and bleeding form of the brave Apostle, dragged out of Lystra as dead, watched by the group of his converts, Timothy among them, is likely to have left a deep impression on the susceptible and affectionate nature of the latter. From that time forward we find him enrolled among the "followers" of Paul. As the stoning and prayer of Stephen led to the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, a similar experience led probably to the conversion of Timothy. What persecutions I endured! Erasmus, Flatt, Mack, Heydenreich, Conybeare and Howson regard the clause as interjectional. but Luther, Ellicott, and Davidson regard the clause

¹ Cf. Acts xi. 23, τῆ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας.

² I Thess. i. 3, with I Cor. xiii. 13, and note Titus ii. 2. Cf. Rev. ii. 2, where the work (of faith), the labour (of love) and patience (of hope) are substituted for the principles of "faith," "love," and "hope," from which respectively they spring.

as a relative one, and translate such persecutions as I endured; yet (the force of kai when it adds a clause intended to modify the significance of the previous one), yet out of them all the Lord, the ruler of the Church, the Saviour of the world, delivered me. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous, yet out of them all the Lord delivers." The deliverance may be vouchsafed by death or from death, by the grace which enables him to endure to the end, by the transmuting force of the Spirit which gives to pain a new character, which turns the blood-sweat on his garments into a vesture of regal glory, and transforms the cross itself into a throne.

Verse 12.—Yea and all, I or, and all too who will (whose will is) to live godly in Christ Fesus, will suffer persecution, all whose purpose, whose regal passion is to govern their conduct by religious considerations, by the reality of Divine and eternal things, in Christ Yesus, i.e., regarding Him as the power, the spirit, the model, and exemplar of true εὐσέβεια, all who are set upon holy living after the example, and by reason of their faith in Christ Jesus, will be persecuted. Bengel says, "out of Jesus Christ, there is no piety." This can scarcely be endorsed. The worldly, magical, fashionable εὐσέβεια may indeed fall short of the great "mystery of godliness," but it must never be forgotten that the religious sentiment is wider than Christianity. Many purpose to live (εὐσεβῶς) religiously, piously, godly, without traversing the fashion of this world, and therefore they do not discover or arouse the hostility of the world. If, however, any man sets himself to

r See here Ellicott's careful treatment of καί—δε. Cf. notes I Tim. iii. 10. When καί and δέ occur in the same sentence καί has the force of even, or also, or too, and δέ of and. Winer's Greek Grammar, p. 553; Jell's, § 769.

press forward the example and supreme claim of Christ, if he proceeds to insist on Christian morality in business, law, or politics, he will soon find the truth of the Lord's own words, "If they have persecuted ME, they will also persecute you." Timothy then must resign himself to persecution and pain, and to God's method of deliverance. But neither he nor we must dignify by the name of "persecution" all the awkwardnesses arising from incompatible tempers, or the trouble which the minister of Christ will be sure to encounter from those who do not understand and appreciate him.

Verse 13.—But evil men and seducers (yóntes) will make progress towards the worse, to worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Though they will reveal their own folly, and the victory will ultimately be with Christ, yet these seductive persons and principles will not stop at their present misrepresentations and excesses.

The dark arts of superstition were utilized by the clever speculators and false teachers. Simon, the goës of Samaria, combined Oriental ideas of the evil of matter with fragments of Hebrew and Christian faith, and appears to have harassed the career of Peter from Samaria to Rome. This residuum of historic truth may at least be gleaned from the Clementine literature. In Cyprus, Elymas endeavoured to turn from the faith the opening mind of the pro-consul Sergius Paulus. In the city of Ephesus, in conjunction with the worship of Artemis, Jewish exorcists and students of occult thaumaturgy strove to make use of the name of Jesus to produce certain magical results,

¹ Cf. John xv. 19, xvi. 33, and Matt. v. 11.
² Acts viii. 9–18.
³ Acts xiii. 6.

and miserably failed. In later years Asia was the congenial home of the Montanistic excesses, while Apollonius of Tyana and Peregrinus Proteus and others found appropriate soil in this same region for their peculiar attack on Christianity. The Apostle says such men not only deceive others but deceive themselves.2 None do such fatal work with souls as those who are self-deceived, who have the power of a spurious earnestness and strong faith to back their antagonism to God's truth. Those who are under strong delusion and believe a lie have often wielded a deadly facility in diffusing error. The wild enthusiasm of Buddhist and Brahmin, of the Fakir and the devil prophet, the fierce eagerness of a conscientious atheist, and the strenuous insistence of a genuine believer in Joseph Smith or Joanna Southcote, being deceived, or having fully convinced himself, does delude others, with fatal facility, into the strongholds of his own delusions.

Terse 14.—But do thou, in opposition to all deceptive teaching by dupes or others, continue in the things which thou didst learn, and of which thou wert well assured 3 by personal conviction, that distinguishing characteristic of genuine certitude. Thou wert thoroughly convinced by sufficient evidence, by true insight and inward experience. Knowing,4 inasmuch as thou dost know, from whom,5 from what person thou didst learn them.

Acts xix. 13. Cf. Josephus, Antiq. viii. 2, 5.

Engel and Heydenreich refer the $\pi \lambda a \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau e c$ to the $\gamma \tilde{\omega} \eta \tau e c$, the $\pi \lambda a \nu \tilde{\omega} \mu e \nu \omega$ to the $\pi \sigma \nu \eta \rho o i$. But there is no need to do this.

³ Πιστόω not πιστεύω. This word in Homer means to obtain a pledge of fidelity. It is used in the middle voice by Thucydides for "to confirm," but by Homer, *Od.* "to be convinced."

⁴ Cf. for this use of είδώς the μη είδότες of Mark xii. 24.

⁵ Tischendorf, on the authority of \aleph , A, C, F, G, P, 17, 71, has gone back in 8th ed. to $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau i \nu \omega \nu$; so also Tregelles, Lachmann, Oosterzee, Huther.

If the text is $\tau l \nu \omega \nu$ rather than $\tau l \nu \omega s$, then Lois, Eunike, and possibly Luke and Silvanus, were associated with St. Paul in the early education of Timothy. There were sacerdotal reasons for altering the plural of this text to the singular rather than the reverse, and hence we judge that $\tau l \nu \omega \nu$ is the true reading; moreover, the context points in the same direction; for Paul goes on to say—

Verse 15.—Even because (if on is causal) thou knowest from earliest childhood the sacred writings, or (if on be relative) and the fact (i.e., acquainted, as thou art, with the fact) that from earliest childhood thou knowest the sacred writings.2 The critics who espouse the later origin of the Epistle think that the unknown author included under it, by mistake, the writings of the New Testament. In Timothy's "early childhood" this would have been impossible. Consequently the passage is another proof of the profound reverence felt by the Apostle for the Holy Scriptures of the old covenant, while he reveals the spirit and quality of his own interpretation of their meaning; for he adds, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith exercised by you in Christ Jesus. "Salvation" (σωτηρία), meaning a complete state of health, strength, security, and soundness, and suggesting the effective deliverance of the soul from imminent and prospective peril, and a position of undisturbed tranquillity, is the most comprehensive word used in the New Testament to denote

^r This is the meaning of $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\alpha}$ $\beta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\sigma\nu_{\mathcal{C}}$. The primary meaning of $\beta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the unborn child (see Luke i. 41, 44), but in numerous passages it is found in the sense of early years.

² Beza translates, "Sciens a quo didiceris teque a puero sacras letteras novisse:" ἡ γραφή, αὶ γραφαί, γραφαί ἄγιαι, are the more ordinary expressions. This word is used in John vii. 15 and by Josephus.

the end of all God's revelation to the soul. It is more than (μετανοία or παλιγγενεσια), repentance or regeneration, which describe the initial stages of the Divine life; it is more than (καταλλαγή, or) reconciliation, which takes account mainly of the cessation of the hostility and enmity between the conscience and the will of God; it is more, even, than (δικαιοσύνη, or) that "righteousness" and right relation with God which is the radix of all virtue and the secret of peace. "Salvation" will not indeed be complete until the last enemy is overthrown, and until all the promises are fulfilled; but it contains or presupposes in its connotation all these famous theological terms. The "salvation" is not characterized as one realizable only through faith in Christ Jesus. Such an idea, though advocated by Heydenreich and others, would have required a την before the διά, and would tempt the reader to believe in several different kinds of salvation, as well as that through faith in Christ. Timothy is assured that the Holy Scriptures have the faculty of producing such mental and moral results as issue in salvation, when their Divine teaching is consummated and explained by this Divine key to their meaning. In other words, through faith in Christ Jesus, the Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation. The Christ is the great Light which, thrown upon the ancient Scripture, gives it its saving power. Christ is the end of the law, and the spirit of prophecy. Christ gives universal bearing and significance to the Old Testament. The sanctifying saving force of the sacred writings consists in this, that they pointed to the great mystery of godliness, and prepared the world for his advent in the flesh.

Verse 16.—It is allowed on all hands that classical

and New Testament usage render either of the following renderings of this famous passage admissible either, Every Scripture inspired of God (is) profitable, &c., or, Every Scripture—not every written document whatsoever, but every part of the holy writings mentioned in the previous Verse—(is) inspired by God, and (also) profitable, &c. There is no grammatical reasoning or induction that can decide between these two translations. Commentators do little beyond recording the names of their predecessors, who have decided one way or the other. Thus Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Cranmer, Huther, Ellicott, Alford, Davidson, Van Ess. Stolz, Knapp, following Origen and perhaps Chrysostom, and the Vulgate and Syriac Versions, take the former, while Wycliffe, the Authorized Version, Bengel, De Wette, Oosterzee, Hofmann, Fairbairn, &c., incline to the latter. The former translation assumes the Divine inspiration of every part of Scripture, and proceeds on that common understanding between Paul and Timothy to predicate other matters of practical moment; the latter translation asserts of every part of Scripture¹ its God-inspired character, and then illustrates further its ethical value. This "assertion" does not seem called for in the conduct of the Apostle's argument, while the eminently practical character of the context makes the "assumption" of great importance. It should be observed that the meaning, the physical character, the extent and limits, of the inspiration are left to be decided by other Scriptures.

It has been urged by Van Oosterzee that $π\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\eta}$ should bear the translation $π\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\dot{\eta}$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\eta}$, the entire Scripture, on the ground that $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\eta}$ and $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{u}$, in some fifty or sixty places in the New Testament, mean the Sacred Scripture as a whole, and that occasionally $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\eta}$ is used anarthrously, with the meaning $\dot{\eta}$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\eta}$.

Moreover, if we were to take "inspired" as a predicate, we cannot include in it the New Testament writings as a whole. Even if St. Paul were thinking of his own letters, or of Luke's Gospel, we cannot believe that at this time they were being designated by a name so long reserved for the sacred canon. Nor can we regard anything as settled by it as to the canon of the Old Testament. St. Paul declares that certain writings, being interpenetrated by the Divine Breath, conveying Divine thoughts, do also suggest Divine admonitions. He does not give a judgment as to the quality of the words themselves, nor raise a controversy as to the language by which the thoughts may be conveyed. Hebrew as he is, he writes in Greek, and quotes largely from the often faulty, yet most serviceable, translation of the LXX.; and the assertion he makes is, such Scripture is profitable, useful for instruction, should form the basis and rule of teaching. Throughout the Holy Scriptures, great truths are enunciated by prophetic men, enforced by simile, history, proverb, psalm: for confutation of error and conviction of sin. Hardly any form of error, of moral defect, even in the best of men, is left unscathed by prophetic word. The oppressor, miser, liar, blasphemer, and licentious man, the adulterer, thief, idolater, hypocrite, and traitor, are gibbeted in these wonderful pages. The little, unobserved sins, the secret faults and great transgressions, alike receive the searching, illuminating word of the God of truth and righteousness. For correction, 1 so that the foolish wanderers out of the way of under-

^{&#}x27; Έπανόρθωσις, a setting to rights, bringing up to a standard. The word is not elsewhere used in the New Testament, but is common in Philo, Arrian, and Polybius. Grotius, quoted by Ellicott, says, "ἐλέγχονται inverecundi, ἐπανορθοῦνται teneri, fragiles."

standing, the weak and wayward, may be brought back to the true standard of conduct. For discipline in righteousness, elevation to higher moral standard, by an educational enlargement and refinement of the moral sense, by the infliction of rebuke and pain. The great judgments falling on races, nations, cities, kings, priests, and peoples, crowd the God-inspired pages. The end of all the discipline is righteousness, viz., that the man of God may be in every way completed and made ready for every good work. "The man of God" is not necessarily prophet, or evangelist, or minister of the word, but it may connote any man who has received a Divine calling to righteousness and righteous service. The word aprios is used as an antithesis to lame and mutilated, and signifies the presence of all the parts of our nature or functions of our calling.

H. R. REYNOLDS.

THE PRAISE OF LOVE.

SOLOMON'S SONG VIII. 6, 7.

In these musical and suggestive phrases we have a brief Hymn in praise of Love, which is the Old Testament prelude and counterpart of St. Paul's matchless psalm in praise of Charity. Unfortunately for the English reader, the beauty of the Hymn, the very fact that it is a hymn, is concealed from him by the malarrangement and mistranslations of the Authorized Version. It is the object of this brief paper to bring out that fact, and to indicate the meaning and beauty of this tiny masterpiece.

The Hymn begins with the second clause of Verse

I Cor. xiii.

6,1 and extends to the close of Verse 7. Literally rendered, it runs as follows: - For strong as Death is Low. This is the first line of the Hymn, and our Version gives it correctly. But in the second line it mistranslates every word. The word it renders "jealousy" in "Jealousy is cruel as the grave," means, not "jealousy," but "love;" love regarded in its ardour and inexorable force, the love that can neither yield nor share possession of its object. The word rendered "cruel" indicates the tenacity of this ardent affection, not its cruelty; it implies, not that it will torture its object, but that it will never let it go. And the word rendered "grave" is "Sheol," i.c., Hades, the Hebrew name for that invisible underworld which so distinctly refuses to yield back the spirits which have once descended into it. So that, as we have no such synonym for the word "love" as the Hebrew uses here, we had better, to avoid repeating the same word, omit it from the second line altogether, and translate the whole distich thus:—For Love is strong as Death, Tenacious as Hades itself." And, obviously, what the Poet intends is to set forth this master-passion of the soul as an elemental principle of being, the sole Power in us which is capable of coping with Death and Hades, and of overcoming them.

In the next two lines he proceeds to describe this passion as an all-pervading fire, kindled by God Himself, and sharing his own Divine nature; for instead of "the coals thereof are coals of fire, which hath a most vehement flame," we ought to read: "The flashes

This section of Solomon's Song commences, of course, with the *first* clause of Verse 6. As this first clause, however, does but utter a *personal* sentiment, it is but a note of transition, an introduction to the Hymn on Love as a general principle. The Hymn itself commences with the second clause of the Verse.

of it are flashes of fire, even a flame of the Lord;" that is to say, Love is divine, a flame kindled and fed by the God who is a quickening as well as a consuming Fire.

The next two lines, "Many waters cannot quench Love, neither can the floods, or streams, drown it," are accurately rendered, and represent this Divine Principle as triumphing, by its inherent might, over all the forces that oppose or may oppose it. Fire is the symbol of Love; and therefore its antagonistic element, water, is used to set forth the powers that are hostile to Love, but which must in the end be overcome by it.

The last two lines are also rendered with accuracy, though the final line is even more emphatic in the Original than in our Version: "If a man would give all the substance of his house for Love, with scorn should it be scorned;" at the same time there is so quaint and choice a touch in the Authorized rendering of this line, that we can hardly but prefer to retain the words, "it would be utterly contemned." And doubtless the thought of this final distich is the sacredness of Love. It is not a commodity to be bought and sold in the market: no money, no price, can purchase an affection so priceless, because so holy and divine.

So that the whole little Hymn, whose meaning and beauty must by this time be in some measure apparent, runs thus:—

For Love is strong as Death,
Tenacious as Hades itself;
The flashes of it are flashes of fire,
Even a flame from the Lord.
Many waters cannot quench Love,
Neither can the streams drown it.
Were a man to give his whole substance for Love
Even that would be utterly contemned,

And the intention of the Poet is to sing the inherent majesty of Love, its Divine origin, its victorious course, its unpurchaseable sanctity. He is speaking of Love not simply, nor mainly, as it shews itself in our imperfect affections for each other, but as an universal and divine principle, the motive and supreme principle of universal being; of the Love which is from God, the Love which is God and in which He dwells; the Love in which if we dwell, God dwells in us and we in Him. And, taken in this high sense, the Hymn is surely no unworthy precursor, no mean rival even, of St. Paul's noble and famous song in praise of Charity.

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

LIFE AND WORK OF ST. PAUL. By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. (London: Cassell and Co.) Immediately on its appearance this book was saluted with a chorus of unstinted and rapturous praise, which went far to create a suspicion, if not a prejudice, against it. Critics of the dithyrambic school should bear in mind that not only do they render the task of the fair and sober critic even more difficult than it naturally is, but that they also insult the understanding of the Author for whom they think no flattery too gross, and excite in his readers an expectation too high for mortal man to fulfil. When they affirmed that Canon Farrar's new book had superseded the works of Lewin, and Conybeare and Howson, scholars by whose original researches he has been spared a world of toil, and even of Bishop Lightfoot, the very prince of commentators, and of Tischendorf, the prince of textualists, and begin to sing hymns to one who could bear

all that weight Of learning lightly, like a flower,

they probably offended no one so much as Canon Farrar himself. For of him we may say—bating the adverb—what he himself says of St. Paul: "He stands infinitely above the need of indiscriminate panegyric," and never stood so high above it as in the work before

26 4

us. Those who wish to study the text of St. Paul's Epistles, line by line, and word by word, must still keep their Tischendorf at hand; Lightfoot's unrivalled commentaries have not been in any sense superseded, and will long continue to be indispensable to those who have to search out the meaning of Epistles in which there are still "many things hard to be understood:" while those who desire to familiarize themselves with all the details, historical and probable, of the outward life of the great Apostle, and of the various communities among whom he laboured or to whom he wrote, will still betake themselves to the laborious collections of Lewin, and Conybeare and Howson.

Let our readers, then, put all that fulsome and indiscriminate panegyric out of their minds at once; let them bring a candid and unbiassed judgment to the perusal of this book—a book that will repay study as well as perusal, and we are much mistaken if they do not pronounce it by far the best book Canon Farrar has written, and even by far the best account yet given of the life and lifework of St. Paul.

If it be asked in what the special excellence of this picturesque and erudite book consists, it is impossible within our limits to do more than hint a reply. In previous "Lives" of the Apostle we have had as much, and even more, detail of the historical conditions under which he lived and worked; we have had even fuller translations of his Epistles, though none so suggestive, or accompanied by comments so original and helpful; but, while Lewin, and Conybeare and Howson-to name only the best previous works on St. Paulwrote his life, as it were, only from the outside, Canon Farrar has written it as from the inside: and, whereas in their works the Letters of the Apostle are simply set side by side with the historical facts that suggested and conditioned them, in his work Life and Letters are fused into a living and picturesque whole. Though we know nothing of Canon Farrar's method of preparing himself for and approaching this great task, we do not doubt that, before he began to write, he not only studied the several Epistles intently, noting whatever threw light on the intellectual and spiritual development of the Apostle, but that he also steeped and saturated his mind in them till, by those subtle emanations which proceed from the utterances of every great thinker, but only penetrate and irradiate a sympathetic atmosphere, their rich and rare and passionate spirit took possession of his spirit, and the life of the man and the work of the Apostle grew vital and intelligible to him. To him the Speeches and Letters of St. Paul seem to have been what, for example, the letters and poems of Cowper should be to the biographer of Cowper—not simply productions of a bygone age, to be

historically and scin lastically explained, but living offshoots from the very heart of the man, in which the man himself, the man within the man, stood revealed. This we take to be the special and high distinction of the work before us, the differentia which give it its value, originality, power.

So much has been said of Canon Farrar's style, mainly in its dispraise, that even the briefest notice would be incomplete without some reference to it. We frankly admit that his style is often too rhetorical for our taste, too heavily laden with epithets of too high a colour. But we submit that those who would judge it fairly should bear in mind that it is these very epithets, and this abundance or superabundance of colour, which go far to render his work acceptable to the immense audience which he commands; that the epithets he employs are not thrown at random on the page, but are commonly suggested by some latent hint in the text over which he is working, or spring from a desire to characterize, to convey the conception or the moral emotion in his own mind: and that if "purple patches" are to be found in his writings, there are also many passages written in as simple, strong, and noble English as the most exacting purist can demand. Throughout the present work, indeed, his style is, in our judgment, much more simple and clear and weighty than in any of his previous works.

BISHOP ELLICOTT'S NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY, VOL. III. (London: Cassell.) This valuable Commentary is now complete; and in the final volume, as in its immediate predecessor, there is much good work, some of the best indeed, if there is also much that might easily have been made better. Canon Barry's exposition of the philosophical Epistles of St. Paul is all that could be desired; it is as good as Professor Plumptre's exposition of the Synoptic Gospels in Volume i., and what more can one say than that? Dr. Moultonthough this, we believe, is his first appearance as an expositor—proves himself not unlikely to take a place in the front rank of popular Commentators by his handling of the difficult Epistle to the Hebrews, on which he has evidently bestowed much labour and reading and thought: we cannot always assent to his conclusions, indeed; -our conception of Chapter vi. 1-6, for instance, wholly differs from his; but nevertheless, we should be sorry to frame an opinion on any passage in the Epistle without having first consulted him, and considered what he had to say. Mr. Boyd Carpenter, again, has contributed an exposition of the Apocalypse, characterized by rare

ability and good sense. These are "the first three" of the present volume, or, at all events, their work is the best work: and "the first of the three" is Canon Barry.

On the whole this Commentary is, in our judgment, the best popular commentary on the whole New Testament yet produced in England, though it still leaves something to be desired and done; and if the other Scriptures were as ably handled as the Gospels, the Acts, Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Hebrews, and the Revelation, it would probably hold its own for many a year to come, and almost shut out the hope of excelling it—a hint which it might be worth the while of the publishers to consider.

It cannot but be gratifying to the Editor and Staff of this Magazine to find so many of the Contributors to this able and learned work—and among them some of the best—acknowledging their obligations to The Expositor; to find also, even where no such acknowledgment is made, that criticisms and suggestions which first appeared in

these pages have been assimilated and employed.

STUDIES ON THE TIMES OF ABRAHAM. By the Rev. Henry George Tomkins. (London: Bagster and Sons.) This erudite and beautiful book is a book for scholars, and especially for those of them who have the gift of a creative or constructive imagination, denied to the Author, and are able to assimilate the abundant material here supplied and to reproduce it in new and living forms. With great care and labour, though he does not always indicate the relative weight of the several authorities he quotes, Mr. Tomkins has culled from the investigations of recent Oriental scholars such facts as serve to illustrate the earlier stages of Abraham's life. The bricks of Babylon. the tiles and tablets of Assyria, the inscriptions and paintings of Egyptian sarcophagi, the ruins and remains of Phœnicia and Bashan, and the writings of Herodotus, as interpreted by Menant, Lenormant. Haigh, Oppert, Meyer, Lepsius, Ebers, Brugsch-Bey, Mariette-Bey, Sayce, Rawlinson, Wilkinson, Layard, Birch, Malan, George Smith, Porter, Tristram, Drew, and many more, are compelled to yield whatever throws light on the sacred narrative. The migrations of Abraham from "Ur of the Chaldees" to Kharran, Damascus, Canaan, Egypt, and back again to the Promised Land, are carefully traced; in short, the whole course of his life, from the days of early childhood to his great military adventure, the pursuit and defeat of Kedor-la'omer, and the successive conditions which affected the progress of his thoughts as he came into contact with race after race, are illustrated by a multitude of facts, drawn from secular sources, which confirm the Mosaic narrative at a hundred different points. Not that the Author has given us a lively picture of Abraham's outward and inward life; but that he has collected and furnished the data, before so widely scattered, and to many so inaccessible, from which, if, at least, we have any gift that way, we may paint such a picture for ourselves. All who have hereafter to deal with the life of "the father of the faithful" will find it much to their advantage to consult this laborious and valuable work.

It would be unjust to close our brief notice of this beautiful book without calling attention to the valuable and instructive series of artistic illustrations prefixed to it—derived from Assyrian and Babylonian sources—and to the unusual excellence of type, paper, and arrangement, which make the book a pleasant one to eye and hand. It is a book for the table as well as for the shelf.

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS holds on its useful career. Since it was last noticed here no less than three volumes have been added to this pleasant and instructive Library. And since we are about to point out their defects rather than their excellences, let us say at once, and say emphatically, that these new volumes are quite worthy of the good company to which they are the most recent additions. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is expounded by Professor Lias - who annotated the first Epistle - with his usual careful scholarship and sobriety of judgment. Dr. Rawson Lumby gives us the first section of his comment on the Acts of the Apostles (Chapters i.-xiv.), in which he turns his recent Talmudic studies to good account, and displays, like Professor Lias, both sound scholarship and a sober judgment. But are not the volumes of this series growing somewhat too sober, and even a little dull, especially considering that they are intended mainly for the use of lads and lasses in our high schools, grammar schools, and public schools? And do they not tend to become dull very much because they do not go deep enough, because one hardly feels in reading them that the writers have put forth their best powers, and taken pains to put the results of their thought and reading in bright animated forms likely to engage the attention of the young? To give but one example. More ought certainly to have been made of the phrase, "And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." It would be easy to compile a brief historical note on that phrase which would be

full of vivid interest for young and opening minds, and which would really convey the significance of the new Name to them. And yet this seems hardly to have been attempted. Bright animated books, which reflect the eager interest of the writer in the theme which he handles, are above all wanted for and in our schools. And some of the volumes in this series are a little lacking in that quality.

Professor Plumptre, however, it must be admitted, is never dull, and hardly ever falls below his own highest level. His "notes" on the General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude are admirable, full of erudition quickened by thought, and conveyed in lively picturesque forms. The only defect we can suggest in his last contribution to this useful series is that his life of St. Peter, measured by the standard of the whole work, is out of scale, and need not, since its incidents are so well known, have been told at such length. The "too much" has to be avoided in books of this kind as well as the "too little." The volume which bears Dr. Plumptre's name has, however, one feature which demands a special word of praise. The Tables in which the Epistles of St. Peter are compared with other writings in the New Testament are of high and special value.

The peculiarity of Abbott's ILLUSTRATED COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT (London: Hodder and Stoughton), is, of course, its illustrations. And these are really very helpful, since they are evidently selected not so much for their artistic qualities as because they are really explanatory of the text. Nor are the expository notes without value, especially to those who have not Morison and Godet on the Gospels, or Ellicott's New Testament at hand; though, as the Rev. Lyman Abbott does not rise above the American level of mediocrity in Biblical scholarship, and as, moreover, he has taken the whole New Testament for his province, he cannot be expected to shew the originality which can only come of unusual gifts and from much pondering over wise sayings that have been long laid up in the heart. It is a pity that at least the common run of commentators cannot be restricted to a single Scripture; in that case even the least original of us might hope to leave something behind him that the Church would not willingly let die.

Mr. Abbott's work, which already covers the Gospels and the Acts—to which four considerable volumes are devoted—is really a compilation, but a compilation for which he has prepared himself by a good deal of reading, and by a judicious discrimination of the comparative value of what he has read, although his reading, strange to

say, does not seem to have embraced the best recent works on the New Testament. Written from an orthodox and evangelical point of view, and following for the most part the commonly accepted readings, his work is likely to be very useful to teachers, who must keep in the main to well-worn grooves, and who wish, as all teachers of children ought to wish, to add an appeal to the eye to their constant address to the ear: but it has not the rare and high value which attaches to the labours of those who, working over a lesser surface, give a lifetime to meditation and research.

A very curious Commentery on the New Testament has reached us from America. Published by the Appletons of New York in two massive volumes, it is "prepared" by Dr. J. Glentworth Butler. Its name, "THE BILLE READERS' COMMENTARY," does not let us into the secret of its peculiar quality, though to the initiated that word "prepared" may do so in part. In point of fact, it is a compilation in another sense than the Illustrated Commentary noticed above a mere complication, the whole exposition being drawn from a long catena of authors, not always, though often, in their very words. Sometimes their sentences are summarized by the "Preparer," or their thoughts are given in his words. This kind of work is not much to our taste; but we are bound to admit that Dr. Butler has been very catholic in his selection of authors, and that his citations are often very suggestive. He cites from many of the best writers of all schools, whether English or American, orthodox or unorthodox, as also from some whose works are comparatively unknown. Greek and Latin fathers, prelates of the English Church, Puritan divines, German, Swiss, and French expositors, English and American, Catholic and Protestant commentators and preachers, and even the flower of Unitarian authors, stand side by side in this strange work. How widely the Compiler has cast his net may be inferred from the fact that among recent or living writers he quotes from the works of, we can only select a few names from the immense list—Dean Alford, Dr. Angus, Dr. Arnold, Dr. Beecher, Dr. Binney, Dr. Bonar, Stopford Brooke, Dr. Bushnell, Archer Butler, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Delitzsch, Dr. Eadie, Bishop Ellicott, Dr. Faber, Godet, Dr. Hanna, Robert Hall, Dr. James Hamilton, Edward Irving, John Keble, Charles Kingsley, Dr. Liddon, Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Maclaren, Norman Macleod, George McDonald, Dr. James Martineau, F. D. Maurice, Dr. Raleigh, F. W. Robertson, Dr. Pyc Smith, Dean Stanley, Mr. Spurgeon, Isaac Taylor, the Bishop of Exeter, Archbishop Trench, Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Westcott, and Bishop Wordsworth, not to mention the Editor and several of the contributors to this Magazine. And still the half, nor the quarter, is not told. If any one should be on the look-out for a Commentary of quotations, surely he need carry his researches no further, but may well be content with the liberal and eclectic provision made for him in the work before us.

THROUGH BIBLE LANDS. By Philip Schaff, D.D. (London: Nisbet and Co.) Dr. Schaff is so well known as a Biblical scholar, or at least as an able editor of the work of other Biblical scholars, that we hoped much from this record of his visit to Bible lands, and hoped the more when we read in the preface that his aim was to "help the reader to a better understanding of the Book of books." It is with reluctance and grave disappointment we have to admit that he has completely failed to reach his aim. He often affirms, indeed, that at such and such a place this or that passage in Bible history became wonderfully clear or impressive to him; but he tells us nothing which renders any part of the Bible either clearer or more impressive to us. We have talked with many an unlettered layman who, after travelling through Egypt and Syria, had more to say which really threw light on the Sacred Volume than we have been able to gather from a patient perusal of this tedious and feeble book. Dr. Schaff has only injured his reputation by publishing it.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S CONQUEST OF EGYPT,

CONFIRMED FROM A

CONTEMPORARY HIEROGLYPHIC INSCRIPTION.

AFTER the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, B.C. 588, those Israelites who were not carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar still obstinately clung to their old foolish confidence in the power and willingness of Egypt to afford them protection. They had already found Egypt no strong staff, but only "a broken reed" (Isaiah xxxvi. 6) when they leaned on her; and Jeremiah had assured them repeatedly that it would be no better now (Chap. xlii. 13). But such a lesson they somehow could not learn; and a large body of the Remnant persisted in emigrating to Egypt, carrying Jeremiah with them, in spite of all his protestations (Chap. xliii.), and took up their residence in Tahpanhes (Tehaphnehes in Ezekiel, the modern Tell Defenneh) in the northeastern corner of the Delta. A prophet is one who can read the figures on the dial-plate of history, and can see how the gnomon points; and Jeremiah had seen the whole broad country, from the mountains of Media to the Mediterranean Sea, with the solitary exception of Tyre, reduced to subjection by Nebuchadnezzar. He knew the ambition of the restless Chaldean too well to suppose that he could dream of letting the rich and powerful kingdom of Egypt alone,

especially if such a good excuse for attack as the presence of Israelite fugitives in Egypt were afforded him. Jeremiah had all along proclaimed the utter fruitlessness of resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, and counselled submission to his rule as the only way of escaping God's three scourges, "sword, famine, pestilence." He now tells them that, as resistance had failed before, so their flight into Egypt will be equally in vain. They have not submitted, as Jehovah advised, and the three scourges will follow them (Chap. xliv. 12, 13) still. This leads him to predict that Nebuchadnezzar's arms will be turned against Egypt, the only remaining free state of any consequence in the Eastern world. Nebuchadnezzar's throne will be set up in that very Tahpanhes which the Israelites vainly expected to be their city of refuge; the power of Egypt will be thoroughly broken; the temples of Egypt will be burnt with fire, the images broken in pieces, &c. (Chap. xliii. 8-13). The then reigning king, who should suffer this humiliation, is named in Chapter xliv. Verse 30: he was Pharaoh-Hophra, the Apries of Herodotus, and Uahabra of the Hieroglyphic Inscriptions.

In this prophecy, as in so many others, Jeremiah is closely followed by Ezekiel. First of all, in the year of Jerusalem's fall, he prophesies ruin to Egypt, as to all the other opponents of the theocracy, in general terms (Chaps. xxix. 1-16 and xxx.). The whole land should be laid waste from north to south, "from Migdol [on the north-east frontier, so read for "the tower of" Chap. xxix. 10 to Syene [modern Assuan, oppo-

r Not Uahprahet, as is given in Records of the Past, vi. p. 81. There is no φ in the name, and the Hebrew "Hophra" seems to shew that the hieroglyphic heart must here have the value ab, not het.

site Elephantine, at the first cataract, even to the border of Ethiopia.' No foot of man shall pass through the land for forty years (i.e., for an indefinite period); after which Egypt shall again be raised, and become a "base kingdom." Then, seventeen years later, in E.C. 572, this prophecy is renewed, being evidently as yet unfulfilled (Chap. xxix. 17-19). Now also the conquest of Egypt is brought into connection with Nebuchadnezzar's long fruitless siege of Tyre, which he had commenced shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, and which had lasted thirteen years, i.e., to B.C. 574 or 573. Ezekiel predicts now that Egypt should be given into Nebuchadnezzar's hand, as wages for his army's unrewarded exertions in executing the Lord's judgments on Tyre.

This prophecy of the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, thus confidently made both by Jeremiah and by Ezekiel, has long been regarded by those who take delight in such things, as an unmistakable instance of the failure of prophetic foresight. The only writer of antiquity who makes any mention of such a conquest is Josephus.2 He avers that all took place exactly as predicted; -that, after subduing Coelesyria, Ammon, and Moab, Nebuchadnezzar made an expedition against Egypt, wasted the whole country, slew the reigning king, set up another in his room, and carried off the Israelite fugitives to Babylon. But it was easy to argue that Josephus, or his Jewish authorities, had merely invented the history because they knew of the prophecy. Herodotus and Diodorus, the "unprejudiced" historians, make no mention of any such

¹ See Hitzig's Commentary in loc., and as a recent instance, Kuenen, Prophets and Prophecy, p. 122, et seq. ² Ant. Jud. x. 9, 7.

humiliation of Egypt; and indeed they mention Apries simply as conqueror of Palestine and Cyprus, leaving on our minds the impression that he was a powerful and successful king.

Nevertheless, attention has recently been called to a hieroglyphic inscription in the Louvre, which brings us unimpeachable testimony, from a contemporary Egyptian source, to the fact of an actual conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. Herodotus is found to have been not "unprejudiced," but merely ill informed: the Egyptian priests, who narrated their country's history to him, had taken very good care not to mention their own defeats. The inscription is found on the statue of a royal official Nes-Hor, a personage of the highest rank, among whose numerous titles is one usually reserved for the Heir-apparent of the Crown, viz., "Governor of the South," i.c., of Nubia. The contemporary character of this inscription is vouched for by the fact that Hophra (Uah-ab-ra) is named twice by Nes-Hor as his master and patron. The statue had originally been erected in the temple of Chnum at Elephantine, where Nes-Hor had lived.

The inscription was first translated by M. Pierret in the Recueil d'inscriptions hiéroglyphiques du Louvre, and this translation has been reproduced in an English dress in Records of the Past, vol. iv. p. 81 ff. Pierret did not himself observe the reference to the Chaldean victory; and his translation is altogether so hasty and inexact, that probably no one would ever, from his rendering, have formed any conception of the importance of the inscription. It is to the acumen of a German Egyptologist, Dr. A. Wiedemann of Leipzig, that we owe a clear unfolding of the sense

and reference of the inscription. In Records of the Past the portion of the inscription important for us is given as follows: "Let my statue be crected to perpetuate my name, and that it may not perish as if I were put in a dwelling afflicted with the ark 2 of the Aamu, of the people of the North, of the Asiatics, the profane . . . (lacuna). I have made a march against the Shasu (i.e., Bedouins) of the upper country in the midst of them. The terror of His Majesty was against the wicked act they executed after having strengthened their heart in their design. I have let them advance quite into Nubia; I have let them approach the place where was His Majesty, who hath made a great carnage amongst them."

This translation is inexact in several particulars. To mention only the most important, a closer attention to the symbols employed would have shewn that the word rendered "Shasu" (Bedouins), cannot be a noun, much less a proper noun, but must be a verb, and a verb of motion: the determinatives used prove this, and Pierret has so rendered the same word a little lower down-"let them advance." The meaning must be, "to behave like the Shasu," or Bedouins; i.e., to wander over the country, plundering and wasting it. We translate the whole passage as follows, in all essentials agreeing with Wiedemann: "I have caused my statue to be prepared, through which my name shall be immortal, never to be destroyed in this temple, because I repaired the temple when it was wasted by

^{*} See the Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache, 1878, i. p. 2 ff.; iii. p. 87.

² This is a blunder in the translation into English. The hieroglyphic is a bow, and no doubt Pierret wrote in French "l'arc," the bow, but forgot that "ark" in English has a meaning totally different. Read, "with the bow of," &c.

the attack I of the Aamu, and all the wretched Northerners from the land of Sati . . . To make an expedition to waste and plunder the upper country (Upper Egypt) was in their heart. The fear of His Majesty was slight (with them). They caused to strengthen their heart with plans. I did not let them plunder as far as Nubia: I made them come near the place where His Majesty was, and His Majesty made a great carnage among them."

Here, then, the Governor of Nubia takes credit to himself for having stopped the progress of an invading army of Aamu and various northern tribes from Sati, after they had reached the very borders of Nubia. He admits, however, that they had ravaged the temple of Chnum at Elephantine, for he himself had repaired it. The invaders were defeated by the king "with great slaughter," but not till they had passed Syene, the point mentioned by Ezekiel.

But was this Nebuchadnezzar's army? The Aamu are usually the Shemite tribes of Palestine or the neighbourhood. The word seems to be taken from the Shemitic by 'am, "people," just as Teutones and Deutsch are derived from a root meaning "the people" also. Sati-land, again, is the wide district occupied in succession by the great Mesopotamian world-empires, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians, &c. An army consisting of Palestinian and Mesopotamian soldiers could, during the reign of Pharaoh-Hophra, be none else than Nebuchadnezzar's, for the whole of Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Palestine lay under his sway. And if the Chaldean host had reached Ele-

Wiedemann renders, "the foreign troops." It is literally "the bow," for war in general. Cf. Gen. xlviii. 22.

phantine, they must first have ravaged the whole Nile valley; so that, literally, "from Migdol to Syene," all must have fallen into their hands. And a rich booty it would be, well worthy to be called by Ezekiel, God's wages to Nebuchadnezzar for his work at Tyre. The only point in the predictions not confirmed, is that Egypt should lie waste and uninhabited for forty years. But prophets give numbers only as the vaguest estimates, and no doubt never meant themselves to be held strictly to definite figures. The Nile valley may well have lain all but waste for a number of years during the confusions of the war, and this is all that is demanded by the prophecy.

P. THOMSON.

ST. PAUL'S USE OF OPIAMBETO.

This verb, in Biblical Greek, occurs only in 2 Corinthians ii. 14 and Colossians ii. 15. In our English Bibles we read in the former of these two passages, causeth (us) to triumph, and in the latter, triumphing over. There is no grammatical reason whatever for the variation, the difference in the two Greek forms being simply that between the present and the past participle active of the same verb; and the Latin Versions read consistently qui triumphat and triumphans in the two places respectively. This discrepancy in our own Translation is certainly not due to accident or caprice. To remove it by conforming to the Vulgate rendering in 2 Corinthians would only, as we shall see, create new difficulties; and the complications and contradictions in which the interpretation of Colossians ii. 15 is involved are also very closely connected (at least such is the contention of this Paper) with the accepted and traditionally fixed Latinist sense of $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$.

- 1. (a) Thanks be to God who always triumphs over us in Christ is the rendering of 2 Corinthians ii. 14 a adopted by nearly all the more recent critics, chiefly on account of the Colossian passage. The verb cannot surely mean "triumphs" there and "makes to triumph" here; for we should then have two really opposite meanings attached by the same writer to the same word I in the only two instances in which he uses it. The factitive sense is now, moreover, pronounced on high authority to be "philologically impossible." What distinguishes θριαμβεύω from such verbs as χορεύω and μαθητεύω, which are capable of a secondary factitive sense (as, e.g., "to dance," in English), is that they are primarily intransitive, while $\theta_{\rho \iota a \mu} \beta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$, as equal to "triumpho," is already distinctly transitive. To ground upon this active sense a further factitive application would be somewhat strange, and suggestions of "Hebraism" and "hiphilitic usage" do not make it less so. No one finds, or expects to find, πομπεύω, to lead in procession, also meaning, to make one lead a procession.
- (b) Yet it is no wonder that such first-rate exegetes as Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, De Wette, with our own translators, rejected the above rendering as intolerably harsh and incongruous. For it would make the Apostle the victim of defeat. And when the nature of a Roman triumph is considered—then, it must be remembered, existing in its grim reality—with the ignominious position of the captive, and the miserable death in which

¹ A point Holtzmann (in his Kritik der Epheser-und-Kolosserbriefe) does not fail to urge as against the Pauline character of Colossians ii. 15.

the exhibition usually ended for him, the figure appears most unsuitable to express the relation between the Apostle and the gracious God to whom he renders thanks. Not so, surely, did God "always triumph over" his faithful servant; nor could such a triumph "manifest the savour of his knowledge in every place." Recent commentators, it is true, do not seem to feel this difficulty; but they only avoid it by vague generalizations which rob the metaphor of all precision and vividness, or by references to the Apostle's conversion, of a nature foreign to this context, even if they explained, as they fail to do, the use of so violent an image. It appears as though the one rendering were lexically, and the other contexually, all but impossible; and between two such evils it is certainly hard to choose.

2. The interpreters of Colossians ii. 15 are as completely and sharply at issue, and with equally good reason. (a) Meyer, Eadie, and Braune (in Lange's Bibelwerk) adhere, substantially, to the rendering of the Vulgate and the German and English Bibles. This gives a sense sufficiently clear and self-consistent, so far as Verse 15 is concerned, and that seems to harmonize very well with such passages as Matthew xii. 29; Luke x. 18; John xii. 31, 32; Hebrews ii. 14, 15.

But how can ἀπεκδυσάμενος be rendered, having spoiled, or disarmed, in Chapter ii. 15, when the same participle, in precisely the same voice and tense, means something quite different in Chapter iii. 9; and when ἀπέκδυσις (the noun-form of this verb) in Verse 11, in the very sentence to which Chapter ii. 15 belongs, certainly means putting off from one's self! As every

¹ How differently he speaks in Chap. iv. 6, closely parallel with Chap. ii. 14, as comparison of Chaps. ii. 14—iii. 1 and iv. 1-6 will shew.

one knows, moreover, this verb in its various compounds is a part of the Apostle's familiar vocabulary, and the figure it contains one of his favourite metaphors. Add to this that to strip from another, to spoil, is never, from Homer downwards—one doubtful instance excepted—expressed by the middle, but always, and with numerous examples, by the active voice of $i\pi \sigma$ and $i\kappa - \delta i\omega$. If general linguistic usage, if the writer's own habitual usage is to go for anything, then having spoiled is out of the question, and this interpretation, attractive and time-honoured as it is, must be abandoned. At least so think Alford, Hofmann, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Wordsworth, and the majority of recent critics.

(b) The three distinguished commentators last named lead us back to the long-neglected Patristic interpretation: Having stripped Himself of the (hostile) Principalities and Powers, He [Christ] made a show of them with boldness, triumphing over them in it [the cross].

But this rendering, too, highly authenticated as it is, lies open to certain grave and very decided objections that one cannot overlook; and it is hardly to be wondered at that it was for so long so completely superseded. How, pray, could Christ divest Himself of the Satanic powers? When, or how, had He worn them? "In wearing our mortal flesh," it is replied; "He divested Himself of their hold upon Him (in his being man), and so could not be held by them." So writes Theophylact, quoted by Ellicott. Here, obviously, the essential point is read in: 2 Christ is made to

¹ See, besides Col. iii. 9, 10, and the parallel Eph. iv. 22-24, Rom. xiii. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 2 Cor. v. 1-4; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. vi. 11, 14; 1 Thess. v. 8.

² Accordingly, a group of Western MSS. do read in τὴν σάρκα, substituting it for $\tau \grave{a}_S \, \acute{a} \rho \chi \grave{a}_S$ in the Greek text, a change furthered perhaps by similarity of sound

strip of his human body, and that body is all but identified with the devilish powers!

The obscurity and seeming inaptness of the metaphor is not greatly relieved by such illustrations as Lightfoot's of the Nessus robe 1 of evil powers "which had clung about his humanity," and "were torn off and cast away for ever;" or by Wordsworth's, of the Yoseph's garment which, as a type of Christ, he left in the hands of his temptress in order to extricate himself, casting her off by parting with it.²

And this rendering labours further under serious grammatical and contextual difficulties. The subject of Verse 13 is surely "God," not "Christ;" 3 and if of Verse 13, then of Verse 14; and if of Verse 14, then of Verse 15 too. This, says Hofmann, "is beyond doubt." Meyer and Alford, with Bengel and De Wette, speak almost as strongly to the same effect. Those who change the subject clearly would never think of doing so but for the difficulty they find in attributing to God the acts of Verse 15. "Ev avrô, it must also be insisted, should be in Him (Christ), not in it, which, as Alford says, "gives a very feeble meaning" after the powerfully rhetorical emphasis with

in the words themselves. The Syriac and Gothic Versions, with several Latin Fathers, translate, Having put off the flesh, He made a show of the Principalities, &c. This explanation is virtually adopted by Canon Barry in the New Testament Commentary for English Readers. He proposes, Having unclothed Himself, He made a show, &c. But how disjointed and tasteless!

¹ No wonder that the Docetists appropriated the text thus read. See Hippolytus, *Hier*, viii. 3.

² The devout bishop's parenthesis, "(with reverence be it said)," is certainly not

³ Ellicott's argument to the contrary is hesitating and unconvincing. And it requires the reflexive aspirated $(\sigma \hat{v} \nu) \ a \hat{v} \tau \tilde{\psi}^*$ against which see A. Buttmann's Grammar of N. T. Greek, p. 111, Eng. Tr.

⁴ So the margin of the English Bible, although, like the Syriac and Latin Versions, tacitly assuming *Christ* as subject, it reads *in Himself*, as Ellicott in Verse 13.

which every clause of Verses 9-15 dwells upon Him. With ἐν αὐτῷ of Verse 9 the keynote is loudly struck which recurs in varying phrase in every verse, till the whole passage is complete, and concludes, as it began, in Him who is "all in all" to this high argument." It is true, as Meyer observes, that " God pervades the entire sentence as subject from Verse 11 onwards;" but it is God in Christ. When he further objects that Christ is not mentioned in Verse 14, the reply is obvious that "the cross" of that verse is his cross—is but, so to speak, Himself in other words. At the same time, "the cross" would by no means suitably occupy the supremely emphatic position of ἐν αὐτῷ· for it is the true doctrine of the Person of Christ, not of his Cross directly or primarily, that is in question here; and οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν (Verse 8) is the capital charge which the Apostle is driving home against the Colossian theosophy. On this point, therefore, Bengel, De Wette, Hofmann, and Alford appear to be in the right, though Meyer takes the other side.

Once more. One is compelled to admit as against the entire traditional reading of the Verse, whether in its popular form retained by Meyer, or its Patristic form restored by Ellicott, that "the 2 Principalities and the Powers" (Verse 15), by all ordinary rules of interpretation, should be none other than those of Verse 10, of whom Christ is the Head; 3 viz., the angelic inter-

 $^{^{\}rm r}$ Compare the way in which Chap. i. 15–20 rings the changes upon the same glorious AYTOS.

² It is significant that Ellicott, in his Notes, inserts *hostile* parenthetically after the article, while his Translation, with the Authorized Version, dispenses with the inconvenient article altogether.

³ Cremer feels so strongly the necessity of identifying the $d\rho\chi a \approx k\xi o v \sigma i a$ of Verse 15 with those of Verse 10, that he even makes the latter on this account cvil powers! See his Lexicon, s.v. $d\rho\chi\dot{\eta}$.

mediaries between God and the world, known by these imposing titles in the circle of ideas through which this Epistle moves, and to whom we were already introduced in Chap. i. 16.1 The warning against "worshipping of Angels," in Verse 18, strongly supports this presumption. And indeed the logical connection of the whole context, from οὐ κατὰ Χριστὸν (Verse 8) to οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν (Verse 18), in great measure depends upon it.

And, apart from this, it is pertinently asked whether the Apostle was likely to speak of the scene of Calvary as a triumph over the powers of darkness in the sense required here, i.e., as an open, public, and exultant manifestation of the Divine victory over them.² There, it is true, the decisive battle was fought and won; but not till the long war against "the god of this world" is fully ended can such a triumph be celebrated. In such passages as Luke xix. 11, 12, Mark xiv. 62, 1 Corinthians xv. 24–26, 54, 2 Thessalonians ii. 3–8, Hebrews x. 13, we seem to be taught that some such display is in preparation for the time "when the Son of man shall come in his glory;" but it belongs to the things that "we see not yet."

(c) For all these reasons, we are persuaded that Alford (with his English predecessor, James Peirce,3

¹ Reference to Eph. vi. 12 shews indeed that the Apostle could use these terms in the sense generally supposed here. But it also shews how very different that context is from this, and how, when he needs to put a sinister meaning on these current designations, he makes it quite clear that he is doing so. There he even accumulates definition, in order to mark out the Satanic powers as the dark and dreadful counterpart of the exalted Beings to whom these august titles more properly belong.

² Compare rather Luke xxii. 53, and observe that all the verbs of Col. ii. 15

³ In A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, with an Appendix upon Ephesians iv. 8 (2nd ed., 1729). Mr. Peirce's exposition of

the French Sabatier, and the German Ritschl²) has found the right track when he renders: Putting off the governments and powers (of Verse 10), He [God] exhibited them (as subjected to Christ) in openness,3 triumphing over them in Him [Christ]. This rendering maintains the lexical and Pauline sense of ἀπεκδυσάμενος, and, at the same time, grammatical continuity of subject with the foregoing Verses — conditions hitherto seemingly incompatible; while it preserves the concinnity and logical coherence of the whole passage in regard to έν αὐτῷ and τὰς ἀρχὰς κ.τ.λ. And its correctness is verified by the apposite way in which Verse 15 is now seen to link itself to Verse 14. "God has wiped out and taken away the legal χειρόγραφον that was against us"—so says the previous Verse, "while" (Verse 15 adds) "he has put off and laid aside + the garb of angelic mediation in which, under the Law, he was wont to hold intercourse with men." This transition corresponds, on the one hand, to the connection between Jewish legalism and angelolatry in the Colossian heresy,5 as exhibited in the following

the Epistle to the Hebrews received (according to Darling) the high compliment of a translation into Latin by J. D. Michaelis. His note on this verse is extremely valuable.

In his L'Apôtre Paul, and Article on Colossians in the Dictionnaire des Sciences Religieuses.

² As quoted by Meyer and Holtzmann from the Jahrbücher f. d. Theologie, 1863.

³ Made an exhibition, or show, perhaps, comes nearer to the exact force of εξειγμάτισεν, and explains itself better. It need not, any more than the Greek verb, imply disgrace. Έν παρρησία=in freedom of speech, without reserve, frankly and freely (Meyer). Ellicott's with boldness, or without reserve, is preferable to Alford's weaker phrase.

4 The double preposition of ἀπ-εκ-δυσάμενος gives the word a pregnant sense

amounting to this. See Meyer on ἀπέκδυσις, Verse 11.

⁵ Theodoret, in his comment on Verse 18, says: "They who defended the Law taught men to worship angels, saying the Law was given by them. This mischievous tendency long continued in Phrygia and Pisidia." See, on the whole subject, Lightfoot's invaluable dissertation.

Verses; I and, on the other, to that between the Mosaic Lawgiving and Angel-Ministration in St. Paul's theology, as decisively proved by Galatians iii. 19.2 Yet this interpretation, so strongly suggested and even, I venture to think, required by the context. and meeting every grammatical condition of the case as it does, is almost unknown. One searches the ancient commentators in vain for any hint pointing in this direction; and, except its four advocates above mentioned, later writers only state this view to treat it with summary dismissal. And the reason is plain. It lies in Priangleious, and in the military character which that word 3 stamps on the entire representation of the Verse. With this is closely associated the fixed idea, in itself naturally welcome, that the passage describes in some way or other a triumph over the Infernal Powers. For how can God be said to have triumphed over "his angels, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word"? If the figure of the Roman triumph is harsh in 2 Corinthians, it is simply unmeaning here; and Alford's remark, repeated from that passage, that "defeat by God is the only real victory," is as irrelevant as it is true, till it be pointed out wherein the assumed defeat consists."4

Esee Peirce's note on Verse 18, and the analysis of Chap. ii.8—iii. 4, concluding his notes on that section. My obligations to this writer, it will be seen, are very considerable.

² Compare Stephen in Acts vii. 38, 53; also Heb. ii. 2. And see Meyer and Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 19, and Delitzsch on Heb. ii. 2.

³ For no other word requires the military idea, or the hostile character attributed to the $d\rho\chi ai$ κ . Exovoian certainly not $\partial \alpha \mu a \tau i \zeta \omega$. See Ellicott on this word.

⁴ Peirce avoids this objection by rendering $\theta\rho\iota\alpha\mu\beta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ as in 2 Corinthians, making (them) to triumph. He is perhaps not far from the truth. So also Sophokles' Glossary.

Given the Roman military sense of θριαμβεύω, then the traditional interpretation is right in regarding "the Principalities and Powers" as hostile. And given these hostile, the Western Versions are right in forcing upon ἀπεκδυσάμενος the sense "having spoiled." This is, in effect, the reasoning of Meyer and Eadie, and its force is hard to escape. That is to say, consistency of sense in the Verse itself demands a rendering which grammar and context unite to disallow! Such is the position into which we are brought. And if Alford's interpretation really fails us, then it must be confessed that Holtzmann has a plausible case when he urges the "inextricable difficulties" of the Verse, and its "want of all connection with the context," in the interests of his interpolation theory.

Here again, just as in 2 Corinthians ii. 14, it is $\theta \rho \iota a \mu$ - $\beta \epsilon \iota \omega$ which creates the whole dilemma. The idea of the Roman triumph dominates and perplexes the entire exegesis of both passages.²

We are forced therefore to ask whether the military reference of $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ in St. Paul, unquestioned apparently as it has been, is really so very certain.

In pursuing this inquiry the following facts present themselves:—

I. That the "classical usage" on which our translation rests is confined to Plutarch (floruit 80 A.D.), Appian (140 A.D.), and Herodian (238 A.D.)

¹ Yet the verse does not look in the least like an interpolation, nor can any satisfactory motive be assigned for its invention, if not genuine.

² Two other interpretations of Col. ii. 15 deserve to be mentioned:—

⁽a) That ascribed by Bloomfield (Synopsis, 1829) to "most recent Commentators," which sees in "the Principalities and Powers"—with a laudable desire to preserve the connection with Verse 14—the Jewish rulers whom Christ had despoiled.

⁽b) That of Hosmann, who identifies the άρχαὶ κ. εξουσίαι with the spiritual fowers ruling the heathen world and hiding God from the Gentiles.

His exposition contains much that is striking and valuable.

2. That by these authors the verb is employed only in writing of Roman affairs and as the equivalent (the translation in fact) of triumpho in its literal historical sense: while St. Paul is supposed to have used it, not simply in this foreign Latin meaning, but with a figurative and allusive application of that meaning. Of this the writers just named shew no trace; and indeed such an application, one would suppose, is only possible when the alien idea has become thoroughly naturalized and "at home" in the language to which it is transplanted. That this assimilation of triumpho has already taken place in the Greek in which St. Paul wrote is, on grounds of general probability, open to question. Quotations from Plutarch's Lives and Appian's Hars, I submit, do not prove it in the least.

3. When the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians he had not yet "seen Rome." In the second instance, though his letter probably dates from the Imperial City, its readers were obscure Asiatic provincials, most of whom in all probability knew far less about the aspect of a Roman triumph than our learned commentators, who descant on this theme so largely. Yet the Apostle's metaphors, as a rule, are "evidently set forth before the eyes" of those to whom he writes, and are the ready suggestions of his own personal observation.

4. After all, the agreement of Commentators on this point is not so complete as is supposed.

In the Greek interpreters of 2 Corinthians ii. 14, we find such paraphrases of $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \epsilon i \omega$ as to lead about in public; to lead hither and thither; to make conspicuous.

28

Chrysostom, followed by Theophylact and (Ecumenius, blends somewhat confusedly this sense with the idea of conquest—conquest effected, however, not δv_{ij} , but δv_{j} , the Apostle. Theodoret and Damascenus ignore the military reference altogether.

Meyer even complains of them for failing to do justice to the idea of a Roman triumph. Now we might have supposed that this explanation of theirs was simply a weakening of the Latinist sense, due to exegetical difficulties, were it not that the Byzantine lexicographers give the word precisely the same meaning, and that it occurs in a number of passages from ecclesiastical and other later-Greek authors, where no military allusion is possible. In fact, the word had a considerable vogue in Mediæval Greek, bearing the sense to make public, also to disgrace (lead about in mock procession), and similar applications.¹

Now is it likely that these varied meanings should all have originated in the imported Latinist use of $\theta_{\rho\iota\alpha\mu}\beta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$, or do they point to some earlier native

signification underlying both it and them?

But is there any actual basis for such a meaning?

5. Θριαμβεύω, indeed, is not found in extant Greek literature earlier than St. Paul. But $\theta \rho$ iaμβος is; and on this word the former depends for its meaning.

It is preserved in a curious fragment of Cratinus² (a poet of the Old Comedy, senior to Aristophanes), where it is undoubtedly equal to $\delta\iota\theta\dot{\nu}\rho a\mu\beta os$, Dithyramb, 3 the festal hymn to Dionysus. And, just as Dithyrambus became a title of the god in whose praise it was sung, so we find Pratinas, 4 a still earlier dramatist, coining

^{*} See Suicer's Thesaurus, and Sophokles' Glossary of Byzantine Greek, on θριαμβεύω.

² In Meineke's Fragmenta Comicorum, Crat. Διδ. 1: ὅτε συ τοὺς καλοὺς θριάμβους ἀναρύτουσ' ἀπηχθάνου where a highly uncomplimentary allusion appears to be made to the singing of some lady, who "made herself odious, hauling up (like water from a well) those fine dithyrambs."

⁵ How large and influential a place the Dithyramb filled in Greek life may be judged from the fact that it became a name for the more elevated lyrical poetry in general, and formed the nucleus of the Athenian drama.

⁴ Prat. i. 18, in Bergk's Lyrici Graci,

the double epithet $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta o \cdot \delta \iota \theta \dot{\nu} \rho a \mu \beta o s$ for this divinity. And Athenœus, in the third century A.D., notes the use of the two words as equivalents, in the same sense. So that $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta o s$ in classical Greek was primarily a synonym for $\delta \iota \theta \dot{\nu} \rho a \mu \beta o s$, before it came to have anything to do with the Latin triumphus; and this older reference maintained its ground, for some time at least, side by side with the new foreign sense. Having this origin, its identification with triumphus² presupposes that it must also have denoted the band of singers, the Bacchie chorus or procession, just as $\chi \dot{o} \rho o s$ meant first a dance, then a troop of dancers, then a chorus.

An interesting philological notice in Plutarch's Marrellus, § 22, shews how strongly, in the latter half of the first century A.D., the native Greek associations of this word were held fast even by those familiar with the Latinist usage. He is explaining the difference between the triumph and the ovation, or minor triumph, and takes occasion to correct a current mistake that ovatio (63as he calls it) was derived from eva, the Bacchic crv, as well as triumphus from θρίαμβος. "The word was modified by the Greeks," he says, "so as to take the form (εδα) familiar to them, persuaded, as they are, that part of the honour belongs in this case also to Dionysus, whom we call Thriambos and Euïos." Clearly the Greek of Plutarch's time read his own sense into the Latin word rather than the sense of the Latin word into his own θρίαμβος.

¹ Was διθύραμβος rather the dignified literary term, and θρίσμβος possibly the popular vernacular synonym? This would explain the rarity of the latter.

² The scenic-processional, religious character, and the excited cries common to the Dionysiac celebrations and the Roman triumph, with the close resemblance of the words themselves—due, no doubt, to common origin—easily account for this identification. See Polybius, xv. 8; Arrian, Anab. Alex. vi. 28.

³ See Schirlitz, Wörterbuch z. N. T., θριαμβιύω.

Would not, then, the ordinary Greek reader of this period, meeting with $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$, unless he had Roman history before him, be sure to fall back on the Hellenic $\theta \rho \dot{\iota} a \mu \beta o s$ and $\delta \iota \theta \dot{\nu} \rho a \mu \beta o s$ to explain it?

6. Putting together the indications we have gathered, we may, hypothetically, construct a theory of $\theta \rho \iota a \mu$ - $\beta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ as the verb-form of $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \sigma s$, which shall embrace

all its applications, somewhat thus:-

(a) "To sing a dithyramb," I "to go in dithyrambic

(Dionysiac) procession."

(b) "To make one so sing," "to lead in dithyrambic" or "festal procession" (after the analogy of χορεύω, βακχεύω, as employed of the inspiring god leading his train of worshippers). On this meaning, when θρίαμ-βος had become the equivalent of triumphus, might be based the use of the word in translation of triumpho.

(c) As the old Pagan processional worship fell into desuetude and disgrace, the word might naturally degenerate either into the vague signification, "to lead about," "to shew in public," so becoming "to publish," "to divulge," as in Chrysostom, Suidas, &c.; or into (d) the sinister meaning, "to lead in mock procession," "to disgrace." ²

The conjecture offered here is that St. Paul used the word in the *second* of the Greek senses above attributed to it, as meaning to lead in festal or choral (dithyrambic) procession, to lead in triumph, but as the inspiring Deity his exultant worshippers, not as the Roman conqueror his wretched captives.

² Similarly $\pi o \mu \pi \eta$ in classical Greek means a solemn religious procession, and in

mediæval Greek, disgrace.—Sophokles' Glossary.

^{*} For this we have the parallel $\delta\iota\theta\nu\rho\alpha\mu\beta\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, once found in Athenæus. It is not very strange, therefore, that the verbal derivative of the rarer $\theta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\mu\beta\sigma$ should not even once occur in classical writers, in its pure Greek sense.

7. Could this supposition be entertained as philologically possible, it would, perhaps, commend itself on other grounds. We have found St. Paul drawing illustrations from the games 1 and from the theatre 2 of the Greeks: it would not be strange, therefore, if he should have referred also to the festal processions, which were not less conspicuous and impressive features of their outer life, and hardly more strictly associated with their heathen worship.

And there was one characteristic of the Dionysiac cultus which must have particularly struck such an observer as St. Paul, and might even be said, in spite of unspeakable differences, to present a certain analogy to what is most vital in Christianity itself. It was the evolution of his votaries by the Deity, with the ecstasy of feeling and preternatural exaltation of their powers to which it raised them. "This character of the Bacchic festivities is meant to give the highest sensible expression to the might of Divine inspiration." 3

¹ I Cor. ix. 24-27; Phil. iii. 11-14; Col. ii. 18 (καταβραβευίτω); 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 7, 8; also Heb. xii. I.

² I Cor. iv. 9 (see Meyer), vii. 31; Heb. x. 33. Possibly there is an allusion to theatrical or processional exhibition in 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11. On the whole subject, see Farrar's Life of St. Paul, vol. i. Excursus iii.

³ Schöne, Introduction to Bacchae of Euripides. Compare Curtius' History of Greece, vol. ii. pp. 523, 524, Eng. Tr.

It may be easily said that the Bacchic "enthusiasm" was nothing more than the inspiration of wine—a statement far short of the truth, for the Bacchus of the Latin poets was a very different conception from the Greek Dionysus. But even on this view of the matter, Ephesians v. 18–20 (very suitably addressed to former worshippers of Dionysus) and Acts ii. 13–18 may remind us that there may be resemblance in the midst of contrast, and that in those days men "filled with the Spirit" were often as if "drunken, but not with wine," in the exhilaration and holy transports of their joy in God. The Dionysiac cultus was extremely wide-spread, and varied in the forms it assumed. It allied itself to the grossest and darkest elements of nature-worship, and yet in other forms expressed some of the profoundest conceptions that Paganism ever attained to. See Brown's The Great Dionysiak Myth, Lenormant on Bacchus in the new Dict. des Antiquités, and the Bacchus of Euripides passim.

8. Let θριαμβεύω be thus understood, and it assumes a local appropriateness wanting, as we have seen, to the ordinary explanation. For the Apostle, when writing to Corinth, had just left Ephesus after a long residence there; and Colossæ belonged to the same Greco-Lydian and Phrygian region, which was the very seat and native soil of the "enthusiastic" worship of Dionysus (here known also as Sabazius, and made the son of Cybele). "In Asia Minor we find prevailing everywhere the noisy and popular form of this cult, accompanied by a large development of scenic games, to which were devoted the guilds of 'Dionysiac artists (or craftsmen 2),' which had so great an importance in Asia Minor under the kings of Pergamus, and in the early times of Roman dominion." 3

Plutarch 4 tells us that Mark Antony was regarded in this province as a kind of impersonation of Dionysus; and, while he held his court there, "All Asia was full of incense, and at once of pæans and cries of woe;" and he describes in particular the entrance of that hero *into Ephesus*,5 attended with all the accompaniments of a Bacchic triumph. It also appears from this quotation that the reference to *incense* generally supposed in 2 Corinthians ii. 14 b, may be connected with Greco-Asiatic festal ceremonies 6 as correctly as with those of the Roman triumph.

9. It is submitted, finally, that the interpretation of

The chorus of the Bacchæ are a troop of Asian women, from Mount Tmolus.

 ² Διοννσιακοὶ τέχνιται. Compare the "craftsmen" of Artemis, Acts xix. 24.
 ³ Lenormant, as above referred to, p. 598.
 ⁴ Antonius, 24.

³ Lenormant, as above referred to, p. 598.
4 Antonius, 24.
5 Compare also Tacitus, Annal. iii. 61. Dean Blakesley, in Smith's Bible Dict.,
Art. Smyrna, conjectures two distinct allusions to the Dionysiac worship of that city in Rev. ii. 8–11. Compare in this light 2 Cor. iv. 10 with Rev. ii. 8 (ος εγένετο νεκρὸς καὶ ἔζησεν). See, however, Professor Plumptre in The Expositor, vol. ii. p. 376.
6 See also Euripides, Bacchæ, 143.

θριαμβεύω here proposed makes this word fall naturally into its place in the two passages where it occurs, harmonizes them with each other, and reveals new force and fulness in the Apostle's meaning in both.

(a) The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is surcharged with emotion in its most intense and exalted form. The great heart of the Apostle kindles and glows as he writes, and swells uncontrollably, till again and again it bursts forth in some sudden rush of feeling that carries argument and grammatical structure away before it, and sets logical analysis at defiance. The Writer is as one possessed, "through the abundance of the revelations," the "constraint of the love of Christ," and" the terror of the Lord," and the whole weight of that immense "treasure" lodged in so frail and sensitive a body. "Whether he is sober, or beside himself," he finds it hard to say. 1 And the circumstances under which he writes have raised his agitation to the highest possible pitch. He tells us of the extreme peril through which he had recently passed in Asia;² of his anguish of mind and restless fears concerning the Corinthians themselves, and the revulsion of feeling that had followed the coming of Titus; 3 of the personal affronts he had suffered, and the questioning of his apostleship; + of the cruel persecutions and bitter disappointments that throng upon him,5 with that which is his daily burden, "the care of all the churches," every one of whose weaknesses and offences he has

^{*} Compare Acts xxvi. 24-26. It is true of course, as this comparison suggests, that St. Paul's vehemence was attended with a sobriety and self-control still more marvellous in a man of his passionate temperament, and equally conspicuous in this Epistle.

² 2 Cor. i. 8. ³ Ibid. i. 23—ii. 4, ii. 12, 13, vii. 4–7, xi. 2, 3, xii. 20, 21.

⁴ Ibid. x. 10, xi. 5-7, 13, xii. 11-18, xiii. 3, 6.

⁵ Ibid. iv. 8, 9, xi. 24–26, xii. 15.

himself to bear; ¹ and this with a frame tormented by suffering and weakened by sickness to the last degree.² Of all this we read, and yet of the Divine strength and consolation in which he surmounts it all!³ What a picture is here of the real $\epsilon \nu \theta o \nu \sigma \iota \alpha \sigma \mu \delta \varsigma$! How truly he seems to be led along by God as a spectacle of one called both to suffer and to accomplish the things most beyond all human power. How he exults, while in this triumphal progress the Divine knowledge is diffused on every side,⁴ and he is made an instrument (and with what weapons!) ⁵ of salvation or destruction to all who are in his path! ⁶

If there was any metaphor within the range of the Greco-Asiatic world which could paint to the life the career of the Apostle as we know him in this Epistle, it was that of the mystic Dionysiac triumph, purified and transmuted by the touch of Christian use, and lifted into a region infinitely higher than its own.

(b) Nor is the figure less suitable to the Colossian passage, on Peirce and Alford's general interpretation, the fatal objection to which now disappears. "God has cast off and laid aside," the Apostle seems to say, "that ancient veil of angelic intervention, which the Colossian errorists would place again between the human soul and the knowledge of Himself." Revealing Himself in Christ, He has shewn the angels in their true light and put them in their proper place. He has formed them into a festal chorus, who "follow

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 28, 29. ² Ibid. i. 9, iv. 7, 10–12, 16, v. 1, vi. 9, xii. 7, xiii. 4.

³ Ibid. i. 5, iii. 5, iv. 7, vii. 6, xii, 8–10, xiii. 4.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 12, 14, iv. 2, 6. ⁵ Ibid. x. 4. ⁶ Ibid. ii. 15, x. 5.

⁷ Just as they sought to interpose Jewish legalism and an ascetic ceremonialism between the soul and its salvation in Christ. Both attempts are frustrated at once by the Apostle's ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπλη, μμένοι (Verse 10): "You are in Him—there you possess the all-sufficient fulness of the Deity."

the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," hymning his praises, enraptured with his glory, devoted to his service, themselves Christ's first and chief *enthusiasts*.¹

This view of the relation of the angels to Christ accords. I venture to believe, with the general doctrine of the Epistle, and satisfies the exigencies of St. Paul's polemic at this particular point. It is also in harmony with Ephesians i. 20-23, iii. 10, 11. Hebrews i. 3—ii. 9 becomes a commentary on the Verse read in this light; and the "ministry of angels" in the Pauline Luke, from Gabriel, the herald of the Annunciation, to the other, unnamed, who "stood by" the Apostle in the Adriatic storm, might afford abundant illustration.²

"Are they not all ministering spirits"—to us and, above all, to Him? Their honour verily it was, like "the Law and the Prophets," and like the Great Forerunner, "to prepare the way of the Lord," and so to stand in some sort, till He should come, between the world and Him. Their joy also it was, when "in the fulness of time" He did come, zealously to testify to Him, humbly to wait on Him, then willingly to "decrease that He might increase," to lose themselves in the rising fulness of his glory—that Christ might be All Things and in All.

¹ Instead of being the sharers, almost the *rivals*, as Colossian theosophy would have made them, of his mediatorship.

² Compare also John i. 51.

³ See The Ministry of Angels, by Mr. Winterbotham, in THE EXPOSITOR vol. viii. p. 409.

HOSEA'S CHILDREN.

HOSEA II. 23.

I HASTILY appended a note to NIGER's article on "Immanuel," in the last number of this Magazine, which seems to be worthy of, and perhaps to need, a little expansion. According to him Isaiah summed up the burden of his prophetic message in the significant names he gave to his three children-Mahershalal-hash-baz, Shear-jashub, Immanuel; that is, Speedspoil Hasten-booty, A-remnant-shall-return, and God with us. This interpretation of the biographical facts imbedded in the earlier Chapters of the Book of Isaiah, though familiar to Commentators and approved by the highest authority, is, it appears, new and strange, and a little dubious, to many who yet read the Bible with intelligence and attention. Certain teachers and preachers of the Word even, to whom I read NIGER'S brief essay, met it with inquiry, if not with incredulity. Their doubts, when sifted, came to this; that they knew of nothing like it in the history of other Prophets. It was to meet this difficulty that I adduced the case of Hosea; for I thought that if I could adduce another instance of a Prophet who, like Isaiah, had three children to whom he gave significant names which summed up the burden of his prophetic message, no closer parallel could be desired or conceived. Hence the Note which I am now about to expand.

Many years before Isaiah prophesied to the southern kingdom of Judah, Hosea prophesied to the northern kingdom of Israel. This northern kingdom was even more sinful, corrupt, and idolatrous than the sister kingdom of Judah, and, by its sins, provoked an earlier

doom. Its moral and spiritual condition was as low, and as hopeless, in the days of Hosea as was that of Judah in the later days of Isaiah. In substance, therefore, the message of Hosea to Israel was identical with that of Isaiah to Judah, though he cast it into a different form. He also had to warn the people to whom he was sent that, as the necessary and inevitable consequence of their corrupt and godless estate, they had exposed themselves to the judgment of God and to the anger and cupidity of man; that, weakened by their iniquities and divisions, they would be unable to resist the invading hosts of Assyria, and would be carried away captive by them into a strange land. And he also had to assure them that, in the strange mercy of God, they should be purged from their sins by the miseries of their Captivity; and that, being purged, they should be restored to the land of their fathers, to serve the God of their fathers once more, and to start on a new and happier career.

This prophetic message, both in its aspects of warning and of comfort, he faithfully delivered to the sinful people, urging them to repent and amend, and above all to hold fast their trust in Jehovah even when his hand was heaviest upon them. But, like Isaiah, he was not content with delivering his message in words; he also delivered it in those symbolic actions which, to an Oriental race, spoke louder than any words. Like Isaiah, and by the immediate direction of Jehovah, he embodied his message in the significant names he gave to the children that were born to him.

In the first Chapter of the Book which bears his name we are told what those names were, and what they meant. In Verse 4 we read of his firstborn:

"And the Lord said unto him, Call his name Fesrcel; for yet a little while and I will avenge the blood of Fesreel upon the house of Jehu, and will bring the monarchy of the house of Israel to an end." Now Jezreel was the name of that open and fertile plain (better known to us by its Greek equivalent Esdraelon) in the midst of the northern kingdom which has been the scene of most of the great battles fought in Palestine from the days of the Judges to the days of the Crusaders. It was also the name of a royal city which stood on a "commanding site near the eastern extremity of the plain, a spur of mount Gilboa," the city in which Ahab and Jezebel held their court, practised their foul idolatries, and committed many murders as insolent as that by which they gained possession of Naboth's vineyard. This city of Jezreel, like the plain of Jezreel, was steeped in human blood. "Here Joram died of his wounds; here Ahaziah was mortally smitten; here Jezebel met her ghastly fate;" and here "all that remained of the house of Ahab, and all his great men and his kinsfolk and priests fell" under the avenging sword of Jehu. "The blood of Jezreel" was, therefore, the blood shed by Ahab and his cruel masterful wife; the blood shed in their unhallowed crusade against the prophets of Jehovah and against as many of the people as would not bow the knee to Baal; and especially, perhaps, the blood of Naboththe judicial murder, the typical crime, which appears and reappears in the prophetic writings of Israel with a ghastly and terrible pertinacity.

But why was this blood to be "avenged upon the house of Jehu"—Jehu, who had been very zealous against the guilty house of Ahab, cutting them off from

the face of the earth? Partly, no doubt, because in smiting the house of Ahab Jehu had shewn a ferocity. a thirst for blood, like their own: but, mainly, because the descendants of Jehu were now falling into the very sins of Ahab; because under their rule idolatry was once more lifting up its head, and Jehovah Himself was "only a Baal" to them, only one of many masters; because there was "no truthfulness and no love, and no knowledge of God in the land, but cursing, and lying, and robbery, and adultery."2 And how should a people be strong who are guilty of such sins as these? how should a dynasty stand which fostered such sins as these, and set an example of all iniquity? The bloodguiltiness of Ahab's house was to be avenged on the house of Jehu because that house, called to avenge the crimes of Ahab, was reproducing and sanctioning them.

When Hosea called his firstborn Fezrcel, then, he meant the name to recall the blood shed, the guilt incurred at Jezreel, the blood that cried for vengeance from plain and city, and to warn the people that its cry would be heard, that guilt so heinous must receive the doom it had provoked and deserved.

But he meant far more than this. He meant, by a kind of pun suggested by this Name, to imply that the sinful people to whom he proclaimed an impending judgment had lost their power, their preëminence, with God. In the Hebrew Jezreel is pronounced Iz-re-cl, and sounds so like Is-ra-cl, that the Jews to whom Hosea was sent would at once catch the play of sound, and understand that they were no longer deemed worthy of the name of which they were so proud; that instead of being named after Is-ra-el, the

¹ Hosea ii. 16. ² Ibid. iv. 1. 2.

"prince with God," they were rather to be called Iz-re-el, to bear the name of the wicked city in which Ahab and Jezebel had rioted in murder and lust, and Jehu had cut them off with a savage cruelty not unlike their own, the doomed city over which there now hung the cloud of Divine anger and judgment.

The word Fezreel, again, has a double significance. It means God scatters and God sows. No doubt there is here a reminiscence of the fertile plain on which so many battles have been fought. So fertile was it that the Hebrews called it God's sowing. But as the sower scatters his seed in the soil, the word came also to mean God's scattering. And when Hosea used the word in a prophecy of judgment, there could be no doubt in which of these two senses he used it. He meant it to denote, as a people so quick to detect the omens in words would instantly discern, that they would be driven out from the land of their fathers, and scattered in a strange land.

How much, then, and how much of Hosea's prophetic message, would the name of his firstborn convey to men to whom the prophet was as familiar a figure as the preacher is to us, and who were accustomed to ponder on the meaning of his symbolical actions and pregnant words! Here was a child named *Jezreel* on purpose to call their attention to the meaning of that word, and to illustrate a prediction which had fallen from the Prophet's lips. Who can doubt that, as they considered the Name in connection with the prophecy, they would see in it all that we have seen and more? They would at least find in it a prediction that the blood shed at Jezreel was to be avenged by a judgment which would destroy their monarchy, and bring their

kingdom to an end; a prediction that *Is-ra-el* was to be degraded into *Iz-re-el*, the prince with God into a guilty outcast from his favour; and a prediction that they were to be *scattered by God* for their sins, in heathen and hostile lands.

From Verse o of the same Chapter we learn that, after an undefined interval, a second child, a daughter was born to Hosea, concerning whom he received the command: "Call her name Lo-ruhamah (i.e., Not-pitied), for I will no more have pity upon the house of Israel, and much less will I forgive them." It is easy to see why, if Hosea wished to convey an effective and emphatic warning to Israel, he should call his little daughter Not-pitied. For the Jews had often been warned, often been threatened with a terrible judgment for their sins, and yet no final, no exterminating doom had fallen upon them. There had always been some loophole of escape; and, sooner or later, they had found and taken it. They had repented and turned to the Lord for a time, or their kings had repented and carried out a partial reformation of public manners. And God had always been very good, and easy to be entreated. What reason was there to fear that He would not be as easy with them in any coming peril, and have compassion on them, and forgive their sins? "There is this reason," replies the Prophet, "Your name henceforth, like that of this child, is to be Notpitied. Do not delude yourselves with vain hopes. God will no more have compassion—what you mean by compassion-on you; much less will he forgive your sins, and turn aside the retribution you have provoked by them." And so, in addition to the name Iz-re-el, which implied their fall and guilt and danger,

this new name, *Lo-ruhamah*, is fastened upon them to denote that there was no refuge for them even in the mercy of God itself.

That would be a hard saying to them, and well-nigh incredible. It was their boast, and continued to be their boast down to Apostolic times, "The people of the Lord, the people of the Lord, are we." And could God forget the people whom He had chosen for Himself, the seed of Abraham, the heirs of the Covenant, and abandon them to the tender mercies of the heathen which were so cruel? If we turn to Verses 8 and 9 of this first Chapter we shall see how even this last refuge is closed against them by the Prophet. For there we read that, when poor little Not-pitied was weaned which, according to the Oriental custom of that time, would not be till she was three years old--another child was given to Hosea, of whom it was said, "Call his name Lo-ammi (i.e., Not-my-people); for ye are not my people, and, as for Me, I will be none of yours." Not only would God shut up his bowels of compassion toward them; He would also reject them, and cast them down from their pride of place as a sacred nation, a chosen and peculiar people. They should no longer be able to boast themselves, "The people of the Lord are we," or to rest in his covenant with them. They had violated that covenant; and henceforth God, instead of knowing them as My-people, would know them only as Not-my-people.

Now, if we try to conceive the scene that passed before the men of Israel for some seven years in the house and family of the Prophet, we shall understand, I think, how those among them whose spiritual apprehension was not wholly blunted would feel as if a grim circle of doom was closing in upon them, and every possible loophole of escape being stopped up. Here was a man, whom they confessed to be a man of God, for ever warning them that, as the natural and inevitable outcome of their guilt, a day of terrible retribution was at hand, on which God would cast them off, delivering them into the hands of their sins, and refusing to have mercy upon them. Here was a man whose very children were pressed into the service of his prophetic errand, set no less than himself for signs and portents in Israel; and as his children are born to him, he gives them names, and that by the immediate direction of Jehovah Himself, which are full of the most ominous significance. The names of Hosea's children are also the names of those who affected to be, who, despite all their sins, prided themselves on being, the children of the living God. And God calls them no longer Is-ra-el, but Iz-re-el,not Prevailing-with God that is, but Scattered-by-God; no longer Pitied, but Not-pitied; no longer My-people, but Not-my-people. Every door of hope was closed and made fast against them; and they were left, in their guilt, to their doom, unpitied and rejected by the God who was their Strength and their Shield.

This is the dark side of the picture: but is there no bright side to it? We have seen the warning of the Prophet embodied in the names of his children; but where is that assurance of mercy and redemption which he was also commissioned to deliver? If we would see how these significant Names were made to convey the promise of Hosea's message, as well as its warning, we must turn to the second Chapter of this

singular Prophecy. Mark how it opens (Verse 1): "Say ye unto your brethren"—i.e., Let the men of Israel say one to another—"Immi, and to your sisters Ruhamah." In the former Chapter the people had been taught to call themselves Lo-ammi (Not-my-people) and Lo-ruhamah (Not-pitied). Now they are to drop the negative ("Lo") prefixed to their names, and to call themselves Ammi instead of Lo-ammi, Ruhamah instead of Lo-ruhamah,—Pitied instead of Not-pitied, and My-people instead of Not-my-people.

It is instructive and pathetic to note how this great change was to be brought about. Not by escaping their doom, but by bearing it; not by evading the threatened judgment, but by enduring it, was that great change of character to be effected which carried with it a change of position and name. In their Captivity they were to recognize and renounce the sins by which they had alienated themselves from the life of God: they were to repent and to turn to Him with full purpose of heart. In the valley of tribulation they were to find a door of hope.2 In the darkest moment of their distress God would speak "comfortingly unto them." 3 And then, in that day, the very day on which they really and sincerely turned to Him, God would turn to them in loving-kindness and in mercies, as He had already turned to them in righteousness and in judgment. 4 And God being reconciled to them, all things would be at peace with them, all things would become theirs. In a charming parable,5 Hosea sets forth the sympathy of Nature with the friends of God, and describes her as adding

¹ Chapter ii. 6–13. ⁴ Verse 19.

² Verse 15. ³ Verse 14. ⁵ Verses 21 and 22.

her importunate supplication to the supplication of Israel for a gracious heaven and a fruitful earth. Restored from captivity to a wasted land, Israel needs corn and wine and oil, and craves them. The corn and wine and oil depend on the bounty of the earth, and beseech it to vield its kindly nourishment and genial warmth, that they may refresh and gladden Israel. The earth depends upon the heavens, on dew and rain and sunshine, and beseeches them to shed their kindly influences upon it. The heavens, in their turn, depend on God, and beseech Him to speak the quickening word, to give the command for which alone they wait. And God listens to this universal prayer. He speaks the word, and the heavens drop fatness, and the earth yields her increase, and the corn and wine and oil offer their nourishment and refreshment to the restored and reconciled Israel, who still bears the name Iz-re-el indeed, but now bears it in its better sense, and thinks of herself as one sown, but not as one scattered, by Jehovah.

Thus, despite their iniquity, and through the very judgments which punished it, the Divine promise was to be fulfilled: "Nevertheless the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it should come to pass that instead of its being said unto them Not-my-people, it shall be said unto them, Sons-of-the-living-God."

All this brighter side of the Prophetic Message is summed up, in the most wonderful way, in the last Verse of this Second Chapter; nay, more, in this single verse—and there are few Verses even in the

^z Chapter i. Verse 10.

Bible itself so crowded with significance—Hosea sums up all that he himself had said, all that he had been teaching for some seven years. It is God whom he represents as speaking these weighty and matterful words: "And I will sow (an allusion of course to the meaning of Jezreel-"God's sowing") her (the impersonated people of Israel) unto me (sow, and no longer scatter); and I will have pity upon Not-pitied; and I will say unto Not-my-people, Thou art my people; and she shall say to me, My God." Obviously, so soon as we can read the Verse aright, we find in it the names of all Hosea's children and the whole significance of his prophetic message. On the one hand, we are reminded of the time in which Israel was scattered for their guilt among the heathen, the time in which God refused to pity them, or to acknowledge them for his own; and, on the other hand, we are reminded of that better time in which, instead of being God-scattered, Unpitied, and Not-my-people, they were called God-sown, Pitied, and Sons-of-the-living-God, when the heavens smiled upon them, and the earth gave them her increase, and all the forces of Nature, once so hostile, were at peace with them.

It is impossible, I think, to study this chapter in Hosea's autobiography without admitting that Isaiah was not alone in giving prophetic names to his children, and that NIGER's interpretation of the biographical facts imbedded in the earlier Chapters of his Prophecy is very probably the true interpretation.

ISRAEL'S GOD HER GLORY.

ISAIAH LX. 19.

In studying the eighty-seventh Psalm we saw that the Psalmist foretold the advent of a time when the God of Israel would become an object of faith and worship to the surrounding nations. Such a prediction obviously implies on the part of him who utters it great confidence in the superior, or even supreme, worth of the Israelitish idea of God. The prophecy is based on the conviction that the God of Israel is worthy to be the God of all lands, that He would be acknowledged to be such when He became known to the nations, that it was an honour to Israel to believe in such a God, and that it would contribute to her fame in the world to have been the means of communicating to the Gentiles so pure and lofty a conception of the Divine Being. What is implied in the Psalm is distinctly asserted in this Verse from the Book of Isaiah. The prophet means to say that the God whom Israel believes in, worships, and serves, is destined one day to be her distinguishing ornament, her boast, and the ground of her fame and influence among the nations. Insignificant in other respects in numbers, in extent of territory, in all that constitutes political strength she is to become a power in the world through her idea of God; a source of light to the nations, drawing all men to her light by its superior brightness, so conquering the world, not by force, but by weapons purely spiritual. Such is the import of the pregnant sentence: "Thy God, thy glory." It is indeed a very bold assertion, and, antecedently, a very improbable one. Every

THE EXPOSITOR, vol. x. pp. 134, et seq.

nation has its own idea of God, and its corresponding cultus. Why should this insignificant people have a conception of Deity capable of eclipsing all others? To excel neighbouring peoples of the same Semitic stock, in that respect, was indeed not difficult; for the religions of the pagan Semites were not only earthly, but sensual, and even devilish. But India, Persia, Greece, Egypt—were these great nations to be outdone by Israel in the matter of religion? What was there in her natural genius that should fit her to outstrip the great peoples of antiquity in this highest concern of man: to become the Educator of the world in religion, and to attain to such a pitch of spiritual illumination as might justify a statement which, even in the exalted poetic style of prophecy, seems to wear an aspect of exaggeration and extravagance, viz., that, bathed in the sunlight of her God, she would have no need of the natural sun by day, nor of the moon by night, but would be herself, as it were, a sun unto the whole world? Yet, strange to say, the superiority claimed for Israel is an acknowledged fact: a comparative study of the religions of the world fully bears out the Prophet's bold declaration. That prophet—whether he was Isaiah or another Great Unknown One uttering sublime words of comfort to Jerusalem in her exile in Babylon-with his idea of God, was fully justified in saying to his fellow countrymen, "Thy God, O Israel, is thy glory." To prove this let us sketch in hasty outline the conception of the Divine Being unfolded in the second half of the book of Isaiah, from the fortieth Chapter to the end.

1. Israel's God, as described in these prophetic oracles, is a Creator both in nature and in history,

in both realms bringing into being things that were not. The Prophet calls God "the Creator of the ends of the earth," and represents Him as calling Himself "He that created the heavens, and stretched them: He that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it: He that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein." These and numerous similar passages refer to God's creative activity in the sphere of nature; but not for its own sake. rather as a foundation whereon to build the doctrine of God's creative activity in the sphere of history, bringing new men, new peoples, new events into existence. As the Creator in history, God is called the Maker of Israel; 2 in the same capacity He raises up Cyrus, the destined deliverer of the elect race, and brings him on the scene begirt with strength to play a hero's part as the conqueror of the strong and the champion of the weak.3 In general terms God, as the Creator in history, is set forth as the Doer of new things; as in the words: "Behold, I will do a new thing, now it shall spring forth, shall ye not see it? I will even make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert." 4 The thing to be done is called a new thing. because it is just the opposite of what God did when He delivered Israel out of Egypt, when He made a way, not in the wilderness, but in the sea.

In this conception of God as a Creator in the spheres of physical nature and of history, the Prophet, and all like-minded with him in Israel, stood opposed to all the rest of the world. Speaking generally, the ethnic religions of the past and of the present confound God with

¹ Isa, xl. 28; x'ii. 5

³ Ibid, xlv.

[·] Ibid. xliii. 1; xlv. 11. 4 Ibid. xliii. 19.

Nature, and hence are at once Pantheistic and Poly-

theistic: Pantheistic in theory; Polytheistic in practice. God is pantheistically regarded as the Soul of Nature, and polytheistically worshipped in particular objects of Nature; in the sun, the moon, the blue sky, the dawn, the clouds, the winds, or in images of natural objects made by men's hands. Under such an idea of God, there is no room for the notion of creation in the sense of originating the absolutely new. Nature, in the Pantheistic mode of conceiving the universe, always was, and all that happens is simply Nature giving birth to new forms or modes of being. God, in Spinozan phrase, is simply Natura naturans. You might as well not speak of God at all, and make the sum of being, the universe, your divinity, as indeed Strauss, in his "Old and New Faith," has frankly done. How different the God of the Hebrew Prophet! His God is a Being not only in the world, but above the world, and independent of the world, transcendent not less than immanent. He is the High and Lofty One that inhabiteth eternity. I He is the Holy One, not merely in the sense which we are accustomed to associate with the term—separate from sin; but in the sense of being distinct from the universe of being; One who would be though the world were not, who was before the mountains were brought forth—the Alone, the Everlasting. Surely this is a nobler idea of God than that of Pantheistic Naturalism, whether as cherished by the primitive inhabitants of India, or by cultivated Greeks of the classic period, or by modern philosophers! For, let it be noted, this conception of God does not put Him far away from us. It rather brings

Him nigh. It makes Him a Spirit, a Being with a conscious mind, a free will, omniscient, omnipotent, a personal God, capable of having fellowship with men; just because He dwells on high, capable also of dwelling on earth with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit, and of holding true communion with all devout souls.

2. The God of these prophecies is, further, a Ruler who has all human affairs under his control, and, moreover, one who rules in rightcousness; a Power in the world making for righteousness against unrighteousness. It was by the righteous character of his rule, not by the mere fact of his being a Ruler, that the God of Israel differed from the God of other peoples of the same family, and speaking kindred tongues, such as the Phoenicians, Zidonians, Canaanites, or the Babylonians, among whom those addressed by the Prophet sojourned as exiles. All these peoples worshipped a Divine Ruler, who was King of kings and Lord of lords; for, as Max Müller has remarked, it was characteristic of the Semitic peoples to worship God in history as a Governor, as it was characteristic of the Aryan races to worship God in nature. The very name for the Supreme Deity of Pagan Semites, Baal, or Bel, means Lord. But Baal was not a righteous holy ruler, favouring righteousness and purity, and hating iniquity. He was an immoral divinity; his worship was a foul, vile, brutal thing, a horror to think of, a shame to speak of, outraging decency and the sacred instincts of humanity; a religion in which lust and hate appeared in company, "lust hard by hate," and the cruel murder of Moloch worship was combined with the unmentionable pollution of Mylitta or Asherah worship. The God of

the Pagan Semites was their shame. Even apart from the Babylonian scandalon, of which Herodotus speaks with becoming disgust, the worship of Baal was not fitted to foster a sense of righteousness; for, as the God of the Babylonians, he was the patron of mere brute force, the Lord of military hosts, the supreme Tyrant, favouring human tyrants who did due homage at his shrine. Jehovah, on the contrary, was not only a Lord, but a righteous Lord, just in all his ways, holy in all his works; exercising a moral government in the world in the interest of justice and mercy, and making the whole course of Nature subservient to such a benignant dominion; not favouring Israel indiscriminately, irrespective of her behaviour, not frowning on other nations merely because they were Gentiles, but long-suffering towards even them, and not permitting destruction to overtake even the Amorites till their iniquity, their scandalous and unnatural vice, had reached a maximum. Israel had good right to glory in possessing such a God, surrounded as she was by peoples worshipping gods and goddesses like Baal, Moloch, Ashtaroth, and Astarte.

3. The God of these later prophecies is not only a righteous Ruler, but the Supreme Ruler, the only God, a Sovereign without a rival. This truth the Prophet proclaims when he represents Jehovah as saying, "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil. I the Lord do all these things." There seems good reason for thinking that the words contain a reference to the religion of the Persians, the good feature of which was an earnest belief in a morally good God who loved right and hated wrong, and made all good things; and the weak side that it regarded

many things in the world, such as noxious animals and plants, cold, drought, disease, and death, as the work of another evil being who, if not the equal of the Good Spirit, was at least independent of Him, and his perpetual rival. The followers of Zoroaster did not find it possible to maintain the goodness of God otherwise than by setting up beside him an antigod, who should be made responsible for all the evil in the world. They sacrificed the monarchy of Ahuramazda to save his ethical character. It was a crude theory, but very excusable in those ancient Persians, when even a modern philosopher, like John Stuart Mill, finds it necessary to have recourse to a similar dualism, deeming it impossible to believe in Divine goodness except on the hypothesis that God is a being of limited power. The Hebrew Prophet, as if respecting the motive out of which it sprung, does not denounce the dualistic creed of the countrymen of Cyrus, but contents himself with a tacit negation through a positive statement of the truth. The God of Israel is made to say, addressing the future deliverer of the exiles: "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; there is no God beside me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: . . . I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I Jehovah do all these things." It is as if He had said, "I am the Good Spirit, Ahuramazda, in whom thou believest; and there is no evil spirit beside me? my fellow in the possession of Divine nature, and my eternal antagonist: I made the things whose existence thou ascribest to his malign agency." Surely this Hebrew monotheism was a higher thing than the dualism with which it is

¹ Vide his Three Essays on Religion.

implicitly contrasted! Lessing, in his tract on the Education of the Human Race, says that the Jews got their idea of God purified by contact with the wise Persians during the period of the exile. If they did, it was not by borrowing; it was rather as being stimulated by a defective idea of God prevalent in the land of their sojourn to reflect on the loftier idea contained within their national faith, and so to attain to a clearer perception of its significance, and a fuller consciousness of its value. The supremacy of Jehovah was, therefore, another ground for legitimate boasting to Israel. She might not only say to her Babylonian masters, "Our God is not only a Ruler, but a righteous Ruler;" she might, moreover, say to her Persian deliverer and his fellow countrymen, "Our God is not only like yours, a good and holy Being, Creator of all things, whereof light is the emblem, Friend of the children of light, but He is the Ruler over all, without a rival. Creator and Governor of what you call the kingdom of darkness as well as of the kingdom of light." And the more one meditates on the mystery of the universe, the more he feels disposed to acquiesce in this Hebrew idea of God as the true one. Amid the perplexities of Providence and the mysteries of Nature, we may for a season adopt the notion of two Gods fighting against each other; but the craving of the human mind for unity, and the craving of the heart for a cheerful hopeful theory of life, are too strong for that crude notion to give permanent contentment. Sooner or later we must come back to the doctrine of these prophecies: "I am God, and there is none else."

4. Yet another characteristic of Israel's God, the most remarkable of all, remains to be mentioned. He

is not only a just God, but a Saviour; I not only a Power making for righteousness, but a gracious Being who deals not with men after their sins, but overcomes evil with good; who in sovereign love forms and executes gracious purposes. This is the distinguishing attribute of the God of Israel, or, let us say, the God of the Bible, of the Old Testament, not less than of the New. The God of the sacred Scriptures is, before all things, the God of the gracious purpose. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in a recent work which has attracted much attention, maintains that the God of the Bible, and more especially of the Hebrew Scriptures is, before all things, the God of righteousness. God, in short, is a synonym for the tendency at work in the world to bring about, in individual and in social life, a correspondence between conduct and lot. The idea of grace this author almost entirely overlooks. It is a great omission; for this is the dominant idea of the Bible. The Bible without this idea is the play of Hamlet without the part of Hamlet. Revelation properly consists in God's self-manifestation as the God of grace. All other attributes are subordinate to that, and are revealed incidentally. The Bible is the record and interpretation of this manifestation which God made of Himself as the God of the gracious purpose. The Author of the later prophecies of Isaiah understood all this well. If there is one passage which, more than all others in his sublime utterances, may be taken as the keynote of his theology, it is this: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days

¹ Isa. Ny. 21.

of old." The God revealed in all Israel's history is, to his view, not so much the God of law as the God of grace. And God, in his theology, is the God of grace not for Israel only, but for the world; witness the well-known text, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." 2 Jehovah, as he conceives Him, is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also; therefore he represents Jehovah as exclaiming, "Behold me, behold me," unto nations that were not called by his name.3 The crowning glory of the God he believes in is that He is the God of the whole earth. "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." 4

The foregoing particulars taken together constitute a doctrine of God which the thought of the wisest has not yet surpassed, and, it may be confidently affirmed, never will. The question forces itself on every reflecting mind, Whence did Israel get this idea of God, this incomparable system of ethical monotheism? Naturalistic philosophy replies, It was the product of circumstances, and of the peculiar genius of Israel, acting and reacting on each other. On this view Israel may be said to have created her God. Strange, if true! Strange that a Semitic race should have given to the world so lofty an idea of God, when the well-established fact is considered that the religions of the other Semitic races were distinguished from all other ethnic religions only by their baseness. Strange also, when it is re-

² Isa. lxiii. 9. ² Ibid. xlv. 22. ³ Ibid. lxv. 1. ⁴ Ibid. xlix. 6.

membered that the history of Israel shews that she was no exception to the general downward tendency of the Semitic races, God's prophets having to maintain a constant warfare with the idolatrous proclivities of their countrymen. More credible is the Bible doctrine that Israel obtained her idea of God by revelation. Israel did not create God. God created Israel, and gave to her a true idea of Himself through the marvellous works which he wrought to make a disciplined organized nation out of a horde of runaway slaves.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER IV.

A CARELESS or hypercritical reader might be tempted to suggest that St. Paul returns, with wearisome iteration, to the task of denouncing the hostile elements and false teachers who had embittered his last visit to Asia; that a tone of exhaustion displays itself; that his voice begins to grate, and his words to pall over the unwelcome theme. Before coming to such a conclusion, it would be well to ponder the heart-breaking disappointment which these immoral busybodies had provided for him. Let it be remembered that certain insolent blunderers into themes which they were incapable of understanding, sundry braggarts and deceivers of silly women, a few self-conceited critics of all Divine revelation, pretenders to systems of thought or methods of life which cut at the very root of Christian sanctification, were making sad havoc among the Churches of Asia. Their plausibility might win the weak, irritate the strong, and enfeeble the work of even an apostolic Evangelist. St. Paul cannot leave the subject which preyed upon him night and day. The increased solemnity of the introductory words and the personal references which follow, make it evident that he is gathering into a few burning sentences all the exhortations he had already given to Timothy, and hurrying his last words on earth to a climax and a close in the form of a direct adjuration of Timothy.

Verse 1.—I solemnly charge thee, I adjure thee, before God, and before Christ Jesus, who is about to judge the living (those who will be living at his appearance) and the dead (those who sleep in Jesus and those who have died in their sins), and (I adjure thee) by his manifestation (the grand event which is the hope of the Church), and by his kingdom, which is already established, which has come night to them, but will be then seen by all to be the grandest reality in the universe.

Before passing on to the injunction sustained by this mighty oath, it is well to observe that occasions may and do arise when words may be rightfully and consciously uttered as in the realized presence of Almighty God, and amid the awful adjuncts of the last judgment. All the words of Christians should have the sanctity of oaths. What is "more than 'yea' and 'nay' cometh of the evil one," and can only be rendered necessary by the untruth, recklessness, and corruption of the world. The sensuality, the moral chaos, the lotus-eating, the paralyzing indifference of some, and

There are three important alterations in the text of the first verse which all modern critics make, viz., the omission of the $i\gamma\dot{\omega}$ οῦν before $i\nu\dot{\omega}\pi\iota o\nu$, the omission of the τοῦ κυρίου before χριστοῦ, as well as of κατὰ, in place of και, before τήν iπιφάνειαν. Each of these corrections made by Griesbach have been confirmed by later investigations. The last of them brings the clause following it into its proper case after διαμαρτύρομαι. Cf. Mark v. 7; Acts. xix. 13, &c.

the malice of others, together with the hypocrisy of the deceived deceivers, needed a burst of intense passion on the part of Paul. To give that passion all its meaning, he sought the searching light of the unveiled Face, and all the pomp and solemnity of the final day.

Verse 2.—Preach the word. The agrist imperative tused instead of the infinitive, or of "va with subjunctive) gives intensity and force to these words: "preach the word;"-you are charged with good tidings of great joy to all people; you revolve ideas which are remedies for all the evils and follies of humanity; you are filled with consolations which may soothe the broken-hearted and dying, and you burn with appeals which are enough to wake the dead. By God and His judgment day, "Preach the word, son Timothy!" Be urgent in your herald's work; in season when ample and admirable opportunity is provided for you, out of season 2 when you have no καιρός, and have to make one, when you must invent your chance, and press with importunity and ingenuity your Master's claims. You must not always quietly bide your time, for it may never come; you must break in upon the busy world with your message, whether men will hear or forbear. Convince of sin and error, convict those who are holding false opinions that they are false, and those who are wandering out of the way of understanding that they have done so. The conviction of sin is the first chief work of the Holy Spirit, but God calls his prophets to utter his

¹ This is Dr. Davidson's translation—more than the Vulgate insta, or Ellicott's "Be ready." De Wette cites from Demosthenes, Phil. ii. 70, λγρήγορεν, ληλοτηκέν.

² Many illustrations are given from Latin, Greek, English, of this combination of words without copula.

word, to deal humanly with human souls, and, by wielding his power, to do his work. Nor is it enough that men should see the actuality of their sin or the extent of their error. The sinful man must have his conscience roused to feel the burning shame of sin. The transgression of the Divine law must be characterized as it deserves. Sin is not a mere misfortune or mischance, a disease, or even wound of our nature; it is blameworthy, and so the "man of God" is bidden not only to convince, but to rebuke,1 to assign the measure of blame and condemnation required in each case; and not only so, but to beseech, or exhort, or comfort, according as each case requires. This wonderful double meaning, or complicated significance of παρακαλείν, belongs to its etymology. If one person calls another to his side, the object may be to speak to him on any subject. It may be done with the view of imploring, warning, comforting, or beseeching him on his own account, or with the intention to ask his aid, and to entrust some cause to his advocacy. Thus the word has come to mean the discharge of such duties; and, moreover, to intervene on behalf of another, and thus also to comfort and sustain him. The word paraclesis thus wavers between "comfort" and "exhortation," and "paraclete" (παράκλητος) is the great name applied to the Holy Spirit, and, by implication, to our blessed Lord Himself,2 as our advocate and intercessor. The high function and purpose of the Holy Spirit, the sublime work of the living Christ, are entrusted also to the servants of Christ. Con-

The word means to pronounce blame where such is needed (Jude 9; Matt. xvi. 22), is frequently used in the Gospel for "rebuke" to the evil spirit, and for other condemnations and serious commands.

² John xiv. 16; 1 John ii. 1.

vince, rebuke, exhort, or comfort in all longsuffering and methods of) teaching. Διδαχή, like διδασκαλία, is used in New Testament Greek for both the method and the results of teaching. Now, as the former of these conditions is subjective, it is probable that the latter is also to be regarded in this light, and is used because διδασκαλία in the next clause was required in the sense of doctrine.

Verse 3.—For a season will come when, whatever be the case now, they will not put up with the sound dectrine, the healthy life-giving word, which you are iound to preach and teach, but according to their own lusts, their licentious and wayward desires, they will have itching cars,2 either "tickled" in their sense of hearing, ready to enjoy the luxurious sensation of hearing what is well pleasing to their vanity, or "itching ears," i.e., ears irritated into virtual pain by the intense desire to hear something which seems nevertheless denied them by sound and faithful ministers of Christ. The latter expresses the idea most forcibly. We all know how an excruciating pain is created by certain slight causes which apparently a single touch or act or word of another would remove, so long as that act is not done and that word is not spoken. The time will come when having itching cars they will heap up, or eather around themselves, a rabble of teachers. The teachers thus sought are not represented as having

The last two words are given in inverted order in &, F, G, and in early versions and quotations; but &, A, C, D, other versions and quotations preserve the order given in the Textus Receptus. The supposed climax of the triplet is enhanced in the opinion of some by this inversion (which is adopted by Tisch. 8), but surely the climacteric force is stronger as it stands.

 $^{^{2}}$ K $\nu\dot{\eta}\theta\omega$ in the active is to scratch or tickle; and the passive has the sense of being pricked or irritated with eager desire, or tickled—soothed that is—by luxurious enjoyment.

itching ears, but simply the fatal faculty of soothing the irritable desire of those who have them.

Verse 4.—And they will turn away their ears, these ears which itch for novelty, from the truth, and will be turned aside to fables. Too true. The Eastern Church was harassed by a restless desire to solve the problem of the universe, to explain the relation between the Infinite and the finite, the link between matter and spirit: and thus it came to pass that many itching ears were led first to ask for, and then to be satisfied with, wild fancies, gorgeous myths, strange imaginations of Gnostics, instead of accepting the fact of the Incarnation, and drawing forth the boundless meaning of the assurance "the Word was made flesh." In like manner the Western Church was plagued with an irritating desire after authority, ritual, order, method of life, which was not satisfied until the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the worship of images, the supposed visions and miracles of the mediæval period, the sacramental miracle, the outburst of fanatical sectarianism gave apparent satisfaction to these morbid cravings. The Churches of the Reformation have been visited by the same or by similar dissatisfaction with the life-giving word, and their vagaries justify the prevision of the Apostle.

Verse 5.—But be thou sober in all things. Huther urges that $\nu\dot{\eta}\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$ is equivalent to $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\rho\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ of 1 Thessalonians v. 6, and $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\rho\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ of 1 Peter iv. 7. The original meaning was "physical sobriety," which then passes into moral and mental wakefulness, in opposition to the religious inebriety of which the Apostle had been speaking. Take calm and judicial views of things, look round, and judge all things by their roots and fruits rather than by the gay and attractive flower. Do not

yield to alcoholic stimulants or sedatives, to religious drams, which may momentarily excite or please, and afterwards leave you utterly exhausted. Suffer hardship; I the agrist implying that the rule here given should apply to the whole experience of a minister of Christ. This is the third occasion 2 on which in this Epistle Paul assures Timothy of the cross which awaits him, and rouses him to encounter the brunt of the battle. Do thou the work of an evangelist. According to Ephesians iv. 11, the office of "evangelist" was distinct from prophet, apostle, pastor, or teacher. There were evangelists who were not apostolic helpers, as the Philip of Acts xxi. 8. Others again, such as Titus, Silvanus, and Tychicus, may, like Timothy, have borne this title or done the like work. Their function was not episcopal, in the diocesan sense of the word; they went everywhere preaching the glad news of the kingdom; making proclamation touching the royalty and sacrifice, the death and resurrection, the incarnation and intercession of the Lord Jesus. Thus the facts of the Gospel were set over against the myths, fables, and endless genealogies, the spiritual pride and perilous compromises, of the false teachers. Timothy was not a localized evangelist, nor was he bound to remain in one place; he might be summoned, as we see, to Rome, and sent back to Asia or Macedonia, according to the needs and judgment of the Apostle. The "evangelists" in subsequent times may have been bishop-elders, or deacons, but more frequently occupied no pastoral position; but as Eusebius 3 says of the more fervent disciples, "leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelist to those who had not heard the

² Cf. ii. 9. ² Cf. 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 3. ³ H. E. iii. 39.

faith, whilst with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the holy gospels." He then proceeds to describe their missionary zeal in preaching the word. In Book v. 1, he gives the name "evangelist" to those like Pantænus and others who employed their Divine zeal to increase and build up the Divine word. The later use of the term "evangelist" limited it to those who had written a "gospel," and of this we have also a trace in Eusebius (H.E. iii. 39.) "The name of John is twice mentioned: the first John is reckoned in the list with Peter, Matthew, and James and the other apostles, evidently meaning by it the 'Evangelist' (John²)." This use of the word rapidly dominated all others, although, in ecclesiastical parlance, the "evangelist" was the reader of the "Gospel" at the Holy Communion.3

Do the work of an evangelist, and fully discharge thy ministry, thy service to the Master of the Church.⁴ This means not exactly "make full proof of thy ministry," or "prove thyself to be a true servant of God," so much as, "complete the task assigned to thee." This is the condensation of the entire Epistle, and is urged on the younger man, because St. Paul felt that his personal evangelistic work, his own ministry, was at an end.

Verse 6.—For I (the $\gamma \lambda \rho$ introduces the strongest reason which could be advanced for Timothy to make his own ministry complete) an already being poured out as a drink-offering, not (as Luther 5) already offered in

¹ Neander, Hist. of Plant. (Bohn's Ed.), vol. i. p. 148.

² Ἰωάννην add. Steph. A. E. ³ Suicer, Thesaurus, sub voce, i. 1234.

⁴ Cf. Acts xii. 25.

⁵ Ich werde schon geopfert—I am already offered. The translation which appears in all the English versions is, "I am ready to be offered." Wicliffe wrote, "I am sacrificed now," and the Rheims Version, "I am even now to be sacrificed."

sacrifice, but poured out as wine upon the one great sacrifice once offered for the sins of the world. The expression "upon the sacrifice" of Philippians ii. 17 is here omitted in expression, but present in thought. The time of my dissolution is at hand, is setting in.

The metaphor is somewhat mixed, but reference is made to the custom at Roman banquets for departing guests to pour out a libation to the gods. Surely Paul would not have consciously made use of an idolatrous practice, even by way of metaphor. The probability is that as Plato has used the word ἀνάλνσις of the "death" of Socrates, so the Apostle used the phrase of his own approaching death, whether the image referred to the loosing of the cable of a vessel when it is getting under way (Wordsworth), or whether it was derived from the custom of departing guests.

The grand fact is that the Apostle faces a hideous and unrighteous death with a calm bravery, and describes it by a genial and gentle term. The strange mystery of his life is drawing near its solution. The strain of his anxiety for the Church is nearly at an end, and St. Paul knows it. He sees the grim apparition of death draw near, and he does not shrink; nav, for a moment he looks back upon his past life with equanimity; he sweeps the horizon and sees all in the rich sunlight. Every struggle and victory, all his disappointments and regrets, all the dazzling glory of the road to Damascus, all the stern discipline of the prison, alike come into sight. The uproar at Ephesus, the earthquake at Philippi, the violence in Jerusalem, the defection of Galatians, the quarrels and speculations of Corinthian Christians, the chains of Cæsarea, the ship-

^τ See Phil. i. 23 : είς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι—ἀνάλυσις is ἄπ. λεγ.

wreck at Malta, seem to him to have occurred but vesterday. Gallio, Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and Nero himself, pass before his eye. He recalls his momentary temptations to swerve from faith in the Christ, to yield to Hebrew prejudice, or to tamper with Oriental speculations or Greek philosophy. Nay, more than all, he remembers how, though once alive without the law, he was slain by the sword of the Divine commandment, and was raised again to the new life of faith; nay, how faith in the crucified Christ crucified him and buried him and raised him from that death to a new and diviner life. Surveying all the struggle, he who was less than the least of all apostles still records the glorious assurance, "I have maintained the noble contest. I have fought the good fight." I Chrysostom has finely illustrated the image: "Nothing better than this contest: this crown takes no end. It is not a thing of wild olives; it has not a man for presiding arbiter, nor has it men for spectators of the contest; the theatre is replenished with angels. There they labour for many days, and are fatigued, and in a single hour they receive the crown, the pleasure presently is gone. But here it is not so; for they are always in brightness, glory, and honour." 2 I have finished the course; it has been a race with jealousy, with prejudice, with philosophy, with personal weakness and coldness of heart, with exclusiveness and treachery. "I have run this race (says he) 3 and reached the goal. I have outstripped my competitors. I have cleared the course. I see the end." And then he adds, dropping all

¹ Observe the form of the expression, "the fight or contest, the good one." The $\dot{\eta}\gamma\dot{\omega}n\omega=I$ have fought it in the past, and I am doing it still.

² Translated by Fairbairn.

³ Cf. Phil. iii. 12; I Cor. ix. 24; Acts xx. 24; Heb. xii. 1, 2.

metaphor, 1 " I have kept (or guarded) the faith." undue confidence on his part. Doubtless the contrast between what one might be, and wishes to be, and what one really is, becomes an agony to the saint of God, and deep humility supervenes; yet the heart of the humble believer often bursts with joy on reviewing all the way that he has trodden. The meek takes his inheritance, and is satisfied with the goodness of the Lord. The "faith" might mean "fidelity to the Ruler of the racecourse" (Heydenreich), or, objectively taken, the whole of "the Christian faith," or, what is more probable, the subjective faith, the appropriation of Divine grace. He has "held fast the beginning of his confidence unto the end." Modern temptations to relinquish our confidence in Christ may help us to understand the triumphant words, "I have guarded (my) faith."

Force 8.—And as for the rest and the future, henceforth 2 there is laid up for me, as a crown of wild olive might be already woven and in the hand of the ruler of the contest in the Olympic games, the crown of right-cousness. This genitive has been variously explained. Thus Heinrichs thinks it denotes the crown which is given by the righteous Judge to the man who is worthy of it. Ellicott that it is a kind of genitive of possession, and says it is the "corona given to the claim originated by the possession of righteousness." Huther regards it simply as the genitive of opposition, "the full manifestation to believers of the righteousness which is really given to them in their faith." The idea seems to me to be this. We have "righteousness" now, i.e., we do

¹ Res bis per metaphoram expressa nunc tertio loco exprimitur proprie.—Bengel.
² So De Wette, Wiesinger, Ellicott, Davidson, &c.

enter by faith into right relations with God, but we have not received its "crown," its visible demonstration, or its Divine seal, or the eternal guarantee of its possession. The crown is in view, and will be bestowed in due time. The crown is that which the Lord the rightcous judge will render to me at that day. He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. The Divine righteousness rules the administration of Divine mercy. Salvation based on righteousness is the true issue of the Biblical teaching with reference to the Divine character. The "righteous judge" is here contrasted with the unrighteous judge who would condemn the writer very shortly to a violent death. "That day" on which the award will be made is the day of the great Epiphany.

Whatever be the condition of the reconciled and sanctified soul at death, we are told that a "day" is coming when the vindication of Christ will be complete. and the world will be judged by Him in righteousness: then will the Apostle's righteousness be crowned with joy and peace. And not to me only, but to all those who have loved his appearing. The exclusion from this joy of all those who have dreaded his triumph, and would retard his coming, is inexpressibly solemn. An habitual longing for the full manifestation of the Christ, a desire to see Him in his glory and receive his award, is one of the surest signs of an imperishable and holy life. Sympathy with God's righteousness, entire confidence in the sovereignty and character of Christ, not only as the perfect ideal of man, but as the king and judge of all men, will prove a potent test of any genuine union to Christ. The love of the appearing

¹ Cf. Chap. i. 12, 18; 2 Thess. i. 10.

means that the coming of Christ to the soul would be more than welcomed. Few words of the Apostle have been more prized and repeated more frequently than these. We see from them the full expression of Christian experience amid circumstances that appeal at once to our entire sympathy. There is much in the New Testament which tells us how to live, how to resist temptation, how to do good and gracious things, and to be in perfect peace with God. There are many grand words which meet the speculative scepticism of the heart about atonement, grace, resurrection, and which ignore rather than solve the mystery of death; but these Divine words are among the very few in the New Testament which shew us how not only a Christian Apostle, but how all lovers of the appearing of Christ, may meet their inevitable change—may die and turn to their dust.

Verses 9-22. — The closing paragraph reverts to the affairs of this life. The psychological fact is well known and differently interpreted, that in full view of death good men, who know they have not many hours to live, will yet speak of life as though it were to last for days, or months, or years. It is not strange that after all Paul should once more press Timothy to come to him. Dr. Davidson says, Paul would not have asked for such solace. He would have been content to have died alone; but Paul was a thorough man with a great human heart, and, like his Master, he yearned for sympathy even to the last. It was and must have been at risk of his life that Timothy, a fast friend of Paul's, should have ventured at this moment to visit Rome, or to identify himself with a malefactor in the Mamertine or some similar dungeon.

Everything suggests that when Timothy received this message he was in Ephesus. Yet there is one statement hardly compatible with it: viz., that Tychicus had been already sent to Ephesus, which could hardly have been written if Timothy were known to be there and Tychicus were the bearer of the letter to him. One supposition, however, reduces this difficulty. Tychicus may have received Paul's commission to take the place of Timothy, and so to lessen his natural anxieties on leaving the Church of Ephesus to its seething excitement and false teachers. The other references to the friends of Paul are all calculated to explain to Timothy the loneliness of the Apostle, a circumstance of which he was not aware.

Earnestly strive 1 to come to me quickly—"You have difficulties and apprehensions, but make the effort and come." The reasons given in these closing words are that Paul is bereft of his evangelistic helpers, and on this wise: Demas (contracted form of Demetrius, mentioned Col. iv. 14 and Philem. 24), inasmuch as he has loved this present world more than the risk of my friendship at this crisis, forsook me and went to Thessalonica. There are conjectures with reference to this movement of Demas, but none worth reciting. Crescens, or Kreskes, to Gaul, 2 Titus to Dalmatia, the south-western portion of Illyria, between the Drinus and the sea. Titus was, as we know, summoned from Crete to Nicopolis in Epirus, where Paul intended to winter. Since the place of the Apostle's arrest cannot

² Tischendorf (8th ed.) has brought Γαλλιαν into the text on authority of Ν, C, and many cursives and references of Eusebius, iii, 4.

 $^{^{\}text{T}}\Sigma\pi\sigma\nu\delta\acute{a}''_{\epsilon}\epsilon\nu$, not $\sigma\pi\epsilon\acute{b}\acute{c}\epsilon\nu$. The fundamental idea of the former is to be in carnest, of the latter to be in haste, though they both are used in the inverse sense as secondary meanings (Palm and Rost).

be finally determined, so the moment or reason of Titus being despatched to Dalmatia cannot be settled. All that we gather from this is that the fact, whether already known or not known to Timothy, is used as an argument for Timothy to hasten.

Luke only is with me. It is unnecessary here to review or enumerate the references to Luke's presence and friendship. He was with his friend when he wrote the Epistles to Colossians (Chap. iv. 14) and to Philemon (Verse 24), but for some reason he was absent when the Epistle to the Philippians was penned. This fact discriminates the first from the second imprisonment. Having taken up Mark, as though he was somewhere on Timothy's route from Ephesus to Rome--bring him with thee, for he is serviceable to me for ministry. language is far more sympathetic than that in Colossiansiv. 10, where this cousin of Barnabas is commended to the Colossians; but the Apostle adds significantly that they had "received commandments concerning him." These "commands" may have been recommendations which were thereby confirmed; but it seems more probable that they were suspicions now to be cancelled. The original quarrel with Barnabas about this Mark had at last disappeared, and Paul would trust, use, and bless him before he suffered. Tychicus have I sent (as you know) to Ephesus, either with my first epistle, or now with this, or to take your place. His trusted character comes out during Paul's journeys and previous imprisonment. (Acts xx. 4; Ephes. vi. 21; Coloss. iv, 7, 8.) These passages shew still more strongly what the loneliness of the Apostle must have been when bereft of such friends.

Lightfoot's most elaborate note, Colossians iv. 10, on the word are those.

Verse 13.—The cloak 1—akin to the Latin panula, a strong woollen cloak worn in travelling instead of the Toga, and sometimes worn in the Senate—which I left (behind) at Troas with Carpus (a mutual friend of Timothy and Paul, of whom we know nothing more) bring with thee.

What more natural than that a sufferer in a Roman dungeon might desire a woollen cloak, which he had left on some unknown occasion in a distant place? "Carpus," in this Journal, has made the ingenious suggestion that Paul desired his own old cloak, endeared to him by numerous associations, which would be a greater comfort than any that wealth could procure for him in the bazaars of Rome. It may have been one he had woven with his own hand.

The passage has sometimes been selected as an illustration of the fact that neither a verbal nor plenary inspiration could be required for the record of ideas or wishes so commonplace as this. The illustration has been unfortunately chosen with a view to impugn the mechanical theory of inspiration; for the reply is at once ready: The Spirit of God intended by this expression to paint the character, to draw the portrait, of the Apostle as a sufferer and a man, to give us closer access to his condition, and a more intimate acquaintance with his character and spirit. Moreover, the very passage reveals the special interest in and reverence for the books, the Biblia, the identical

The Manuscripts differ. The Textus Receptus reads $\phi \alpha \iota \lambda \delta \nu \eta \nu$; other readings are, $\phi \alpha \iota \nu \delta \lambda \eta \nu$, $\phi \alpha \iota \lambda \delta \nu \eta \nu$, $\phi \epsilon \lambda \delta \nu \eta \nu$. Chrysostom writes $\phi \epsilon \lambda \delta \iota \eta \nu$, and seems to doubt whether it is a garment or tunic, or a case or purse. Suidas says $\phi \alpha \iota \nu \delta \lambda \eta \rho$ is a warm cloak, a tunic (= $\phi \alpha \iota \iota \lambda \delta \nu \eta \rho$), or even a priestly tunic; while $\phi \alpha \iota \lambda \delta \nu \eta \rho$ is a small roll of parchment and also a small tunic. $\Phi \epsilon \lambda \delta \nu \eta \rho$ is a "thick travelling cloak" (Weitstein, ii. p. 366). So that with all forms of the reading, "cloak" prevails as the meaning.

copies of the "Law" and "Psalms" and "Prophets," which the Apostle had probably marked through and through with his autograph asterisks and notes. The Biblia may have included amongst them the Gospel of Matthew or Luke, a Manuscript of the Acts, or copies of his own earlier Letters to the Churches. And especially the parchments. What these documents contained we can only conjecture—letters they may have been certificates of citizenship and nationality, or proofs, perhaps, of his acquittal on his earlier trial. They may have been left at Troas for safety, or by accident, and great occasion has now arisen for their use. They were more precious than the cloak, more needed than the books: "especially the parchments."

Verse 14. — Alexander the coppersmith, or brassfounder. This epithet discriminates him from the Alexander associated with Hymenæus in 1 Timothy i. 20, and said there to have been excommunicated, either at Corinth or Ephesus, by the Apostle. It is far more probable that he is identified with the Ephesian whom the Jews had used as their tool against Paul nearly ten years previously. The ground of Paul's reproach is, on the present occasion, Alexander's bitterness—of personal hostility, not the perverseness of his intellectual speculations. This Alexander manifested's towards me much ill-will, either at Ephesus, or on my journey, or in my first appearance before my

* Conybeare and Howson think it may have been the same person, and Huther does not regard the objections of De Wette as decisive.

2 Acts xix. 33.

^{3 &#}x27;Eνĉεικνυμ in the active is constantly used in a forensic sense (both good and evil), and Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, and others think that, though here used in the middle, it has the sense of "brought evil charges against me." But it seems certain that in the middle voice this word has an ordinary and not technical sense.

judges; since when, however, he must have returned to Ephesus. The Lord will render to him according to his works. The evidence in favour of this reading preponderates. Paul was justified in thus solemnly leaving Alexander to the judgment of God.

Verse 15.—Of whom be thou on thy guard; for he greatly withstood our words, or our arguments. This may mean "thine and mine." He may have urged or suggested Paul's violation of Roman law, and was perhaps, as we say now, subpæned as a witness on the first count of the prosecution.

Verse 16.—At my first defence. Paul, in Philippians i. 7, uses similar words; ² but he cannot now be referring to the same event, for Timothy was then at his side.³ The whole charge against Paul consisted of several counts, which were considered seriatim.⁴ No one stood forward with me as my patronus or amicus before the judices. We cannot say what was the precise nature of the charges brought against the Apostle, whether it was violation of some Roman law, or new edict, or had to do with the absence of documents, or touched the sanctity of the licitæ religiones, or raked up the old Jewish calumnies. The custom of the Roman courts allowed witnesses to speak in a prisoner's favour. On this occasion his friends were afraid to stand for-

The text ἀποδώσει is found in \Re , A, C, D, F, and many versions, and is preferred by Tischendorf. The fact that Justin Martyr endeavours to explain away the force of the imprecation shews that he must have read ἀποδόιη. If this were the text, it must be taken in connection with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ λογισθείη of Verse 16.

² Έν . . . $\tau \tilde{\eta}$ ἀπολογία . . . $\tau \tilde{o}\tilde{v}$ εὐαγγελιον, where the article is necessitated by the following dependent clause, and therefore has a different meaning.

Phil. i. I.

⁴ Suetonius (Nero. 15) says that it was customary to hear causes thus in separate departments. Wieseler supposed that reference is made to the actio and ampliation of the ancient system, but it is probable that under the Empire this practice was discontinued.

ward at his side, lest, from some incautious word, they might perchance be transformed into bonfires for the imperial gardens on a gala evening. They all descrted me. Onesiphorus must have left Rome. Luke's testimony would have been valueless, from his close intimacy and his probably equal personal peril. Concerning all the others whom Timothy might readily suppose available. St. Paul proceeds to give some account, but, with Christlike forbearance for those who might have safely appeared but failed to do so, he adds, May it not be reckoned as a charge or fault to them! He thought of their temptation rather than of their cowardice, and imitates the protomartyr in his dying prayers.

Verse 17.—But (nevertheless, howbeit, on the other hand) the Lord stood by me and inwardly strengthened me—"Divine energy gave me courage." "My eyes were opened to see my Lord, in order that by my means the proclamation of the Gospel might be fully accomplished. Those who conclude that the Epistle is genuine, and that it was written towards the close of the first imprisonment, suppose this to refer to Paul's subsequent preaching in Spain, or elsewhere; but the usage of the word in this very epistle justifies the rendering given above: in order that all the nations men representing all the peoples of the Empire who crowded the courts on such occasions—might hear. Paul defended his own cause without human help of any kind, and with such convincing force, that he adds, I was delivered out of the lion's jaw. This may have referred to the gladiatorial sport to which he was in peril of being condemned, or, what is more probable, to the

¹ Συμπαραγίνεσθαι is a technical word to denote this right claimed by dependants. Lucian (De Morte Peregrini, § 13) derided the readiness with which Christians were ready to help each other in this way.

imperial monster himself. The language of the Psalms (xxii. 21; xxxv. 17; lvii. 4) is quite sufficient to explain his expression as a figurative reference to extreme

peril.

Verse 18. — The Lord will (moreover, 1) deliver (rescue) me from every evil work, not "from all evil," as Luther translated, nor "from all evil circumstances," as Heydenreich supposes, for this would be in contradiction to Verse 6, and the general tenour of Scripture. Πόνηρος is moral evil, and ἔργον refers probably to the activity of the devil, and the fierce zeal of the enemies of the faith. The Lord will deliver him as he knows full well, from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil; from his own moral peril in the pangs of death; from fear, doubt, or falling away; from annihilation or damnation; from all the works of the devil, and save me into-i.e., lead me to, and usher me into his heavenly kingdom. An explicit and grand proof this of the existence in Paul's mind of the royalty and living sway of the Christ, TO WHOM BE GLORY UNTO THE AGES OF THE AGES (for ever and ever)! AMEN! The last word of the letter proper, the last burning utterance of this great saint and prophet, is a testimony to the Divinity, Royalty, Eternal Power, and Glory of his Lord. And so thousands of millions have said after him. Whatever happens to us, to the cause that is dear to us, though the darkest hour arrives for it and us, let Christ be glorified for ever and ever!

We may suppose that a few days later, before entrusting the letter to Tychicus, or any other messenger, he took up his Manuscript and added some friendly greetings.

x Kai is omitted by most modern editors.

Verse 19.—Salute Prisea (or Priscilla) and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus. It is unnecessary to review the career of these Roman friends of the Apostle with whom he worked at Corinth; who accompanied him to Ephesus; who in Paul's absence were the means of converting from Johannine faith to a genuine Christianity the brilliant Apollos; who visited Rome about the time when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans; who had returned to Ephesus when he penned his first Epistle to the Corinthians; and who seemed to be in Ephesus at this later period. We have already said all that is needed about the household of Onesiphorus. The young people were much in the Apostle's heart, and he sends them once more his love. This reiteration is very touching.

Verse 20. - Exastus remained at Corinth. An Erastus accompanied Timothy to Corinth,5 and an Erastus, chamberlain (οῖκονομος) of the city of Corinth, is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans.⁶ Timothy, at the close of the first imprisonment, would not need this information, as he had been for a considerable time in Paul's company between this event and the composition of the letter. The same remark applies more forcibly still to the next clause. I left Trophimus at Miletus sick. This expression cannot refer to the journey from Jerusalem to Rome. Trophimus had indeed been the unwilling cause of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem, having followed him thither from Ephesus. 7 The advocates of one imprisonment, who hold to the genuineness of the Epistle, say that Trophimus probably went from Crete, sailing in the Adramyttium vessel to Miletus,

² Acts xviii. 2. ² Ibid. xviii. 18. ³ Rom. xvi. 3. ⁴ I Cor. xvi. 19. ⁵ Acts xix. 22. ⁶ Rom. xvi. 23. ⁷ Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29.

where he was taken sick; but on that supposition why should Timothy, who had been since that time with the Apostle in Rome, have needed such information? If, however, St. Paul had been arrested at Ephesus on a new charge, and Trophimus had started with him as an amicus, or a witness, but had fallen sick on the way, and thus St. Paul had been deprived of his aid on his trial, it became, even if Timothy should have heard of the circumstance by other means, a strong additional reason why he should now hasten to the Apostle's side.

Verse 21.—Earnestly strive to come before winter. From the sixth day of the ides of November to the sixth day of the ides of March, the seas were in those days closed to traffic. Moreover, the winter was the legal vacation. The great matter might be settled before the winter season and vacation; if Timothy delayed, his visit might be too late. Eubulus, Linus (probably the bishop of Rome mentioned by Irenæus and Eusebius), Pudens, and Claudia and all the brethren salute thec. An attempt has been made to identify this Pudens and Claudia with a noble pair whose marriage is referred to by Martial in one of his Epigrams.2 This is possible, as Martial wrote his poems between A.D. 66-100. Claudia is there said to be a foreigner. But the identification does not stop here. Tacitus asserts that certain territories, which can be identified with Sussex, were given to Cogidunus, a British king, about A.D. 52, when Tiberius Claudius Nero, commonly called Claudius, was emperor. Now in the year 1723 a marble inscription was found in

^{&#}x27; Some have said that the text has been $\ell \nu$ Me $\lambda i \tau \eta$: no first-class Manuscript contains such a reading.

² See Alford, G. T. vol. iii. p. 105; Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. 501. Dr. Plumptre's beautiful poem, "Pudens and Claudia," is built on the identification.

Chichester, which contains the name of Cogidu [b] nus, who is also found to bear the cognomina Tiberius Claudius. So far all is clear. Here supposition enters. The said Cogidu binus, who had taken the name Claudius, may have had a daughter, and her name may have been Claudia; she may have been sent to Rome. and have been placed under the care of Pomponia, wife of Aulus Plautius, imperial legate in Britain. This Pomponia was accused in A.D. 57 of complicity in a "foreign superstition;" and this may have been Christianity; and she may have converted this hypothetical Claudia to the Christian faith, and here may be the British maiden now married to Pudens who comforted Paul, and sent her salutations to Timothy. This long string of suppositions is rendered barely possible by another curious coincidence. The inscription at Chichester says that Pudens, son of Pudentius, gave ground to Cogidubnus, for the erection of a temple to Neptune. This brings Pudens and the father of a possible Claudia into close connection, and implies a safe journey across the sea to the shores of Sussex. The links are very slight and the speculation shadowy, yet none can say that the identification is impossible. The bare supposition that St. Paul in his latest thoughts associated our native island with love and kindness shewn to himself, is not without interest.

Verse 22.—The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy Spirit! Grace be with you all! An unusual form of benediction, but condensing into one word all his hope and life. Christ's presence is Paul's last and best wish for Timothy. We never can know whether Timothy obeyed the call, and came to see his master die.

¹ Cf. Gal. vi. 18; Philemon 25; I Tim. vi. 22.

We have lingered long over these epistles, and have emphasized—perhaps to weariness—the various indications of genuineness which they supply. Apart altogether from the question of authorship, they are a most precious guide to holy living and active ministerial service. They paint a period in the history of Christianity with delicacy and sharpness of touch and extraordinary brilliancy. They involve every great principle of New Testament revelation. They record, in burning words and "faithful sayings," a portion of the common experience of the early Church, an experience of unexampled and unique value; they pulsate throughout with righteousness and purity, and reveal a lively sense of the greatness, freeness, and abundance of Divine Love. We find blended everywhere otherworldliness with practical duty, sensitiveness to pain with triumph over it, the sense of sin with that of pardon, tears with triumph, imminent death with life eternal.

The criticism is vexatious, the reasons are frivolous, and the evidence is *nil*, yet by its aid many distinguished scholars have burned the body, scattered the ashes, and sung the requiem of the Pastoral Epistles. We venture to think that they will survive the process.

H. R. REYNOLDS.

THE SHEEP OF DEATH.

PSALM XLIX.

THE hope of a life after death was not the common heritage of man till Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light. Even the Jews, though taught from above, did not grasp this animating hope for many

centuries. Their very Scriptures, although given by inspiration of God, touch this string of the many-chorded Harp but rarely, and even then touch it so faintly that it yields but an uncertain sound. To the very end, down to the moment when the long-predicted Messiah came to incarnate the Prophetic Ideal, the light of this great hope burned so intermittingly and obscurely that the most accomplished class among them—the Sadducees—could not so much as see it, and denied that it burned at all.

And yet it did burn. From the first the greatest minds among them—Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah -had seen this great light rising in the darkness of death, and had cherished the hope that they "should not all die." They had even uttered the hope, and striven to make their fellows share it. But if we study their clearest utterances, we shall not greatly wonder that they failed to convey to others, or at least to the popular mind, which can only be impressed by clear, decisive, and repeated strokes, the hope they cherished for themselves. It may be doubted whether there is any Scripture in the Old Testament in which the truth of a life beyond the grave is more clearly announced than it is in this Psalm; I doubt whether there is any in which it is so clearly announced: and yet it is not hither that even scholars and commentators commonly resort for their proof-texts; while, owing partly no doubt to our imperfect translation of the Psalm, not one ordinary reader of the Bible in a thousand finds that truth here. We need not wonder, therefore, that, as a rule, the Jews failed to discover it.

And yet it certainly is not for any want of emphasis on the part of this unknown Psalmist that the secret which he "opened" has remained a secret to so many, and for so long. He commences the Psalm with a formal and solemn summons to the whole world (Verses 1, 2), calling "high and low, rich and poor" to listen to a secret which concerns them all, to a truth which they are too apt to overlook. In Verses 3 and 4 he claims to have received this truth by the immediate inspiration of the Most High, by inclining his ear to hear what the Lord God would say before he opened his mouth to speak; and he professes his intention both to open, to make clear and manifest the "dark saying," the hidden truth, he has received from above, and to set it to music, to "open it on the harp," i.e., to make it still more clear and impressive, by casting it into an attractive and memorable form, by clothing it with poetic force and grace. Such a prelude might well awake attention to the strain which it introduced

In the Verses which follow he tells us along what course of meditation he had been led to the brink of his great discovery. It is the old story—the story familiar to all the higher minds of Jewish song and prophecy. Like his brethren, he had seen men growing rich and increasing the glory of their house (Verse 16). He had seen them corrupted from their simplicity by their wealth, led to trust in it and to make their riches their boast (Verse 6). He had seen them carry themselves as though they should live for ever; and then, conscious that they too must die, fighting against time and death, striving to perpetuate their memory and influence by erecting stately mansions and calling their lands after their names, by founding families and acquiring estates (Verse 11). He had heard them praised by men because they had done well by them-

selves (Verse 18), because, at the sacrifice of all the higher aims of life, they had reached the poor low aims they had set before them and made themselves a name and a power in the earth. And, on the other hand, he had seen the righteous, men such as himself, who put their trust in the living God, and not in Mammon; who made it their first aim, not to grow rich, but to do the will of God, neglected, despised, forgotten, although the inspiration of the Almighty had made them wise, and they could set the golden secrets of truth to a living and immortal music (Verses 15, 4). And as his thoughts circled round this strange contrast, like all the great poets and prophets of the world, he cried: "Is this the end? Is this the end?" To him it was incredible that, under the rule of the wise and righteous God, the wisdom that seeks the highest ends should be overcrowed by the folly that seeks the poorest and basest ends: it was incredible that the unrighteous should finally triumph over the righteous and good be overcome of evil. And hence he bade himself, and as many as were likeminded with himself, not be afraid when they saw the prosperity of men who proved themselves to be unrighteous by making wealth their supreme aim (Verse 16). However large their possessions, they could carry away absolutely nothing with them when they died (Verse 17). However great their wealth, they were none of them rich enough to buy exemption from death, to bribe him to let them live on for ever (Verses 7 9); nor could they hope to pass through the darkness of death into a land of light for which they had done nothing to prepare themselves.

On the other hand, the righteous might be sure that,

however poor and despised they were because they had not done well for themselves in the judgment of the world, God would redeem them from the power of Death and Hades (Verse 15). Even wise men must die, indeed; but they need not "perish" like the rich fools who had lived as the brutes live and would die as the brutes die (Verse 10).2 God would find a ransom, a redemption for them. In the emphatic phrase of Verse 15—which is the key and crown of the Psalm— God would "take" them, take them to Himself, as He took Enoch, Moses, Elijah, not necessarily by a miraculous rapture and transfiguration, but by a miracle of mercy and lovingkindness, which should redeem them out of the hand of Hades and quicken them to an immortal life. And then, in that bright "morning" which would surely dawn upon them after the night of death, the instinctive craving of the human heart for the triumph of the wise over the foolish, of the righteous over the unrighteous, should be fulfilled. The wicked would sink into the darkness of Hades. in which all their "beauty" and "glory" must suffer disastrous eclipse; while the upright, redeemed from Hades, would have "dominion" over them in the morning of a new and better life (Verse 14),

All this is in the Psalm, and may be found in it by a careful reader who will be at the pains of tracing and accentuating its leading thoughts. But, it must be admitted, that these thoughts need to be traced and accentuated, that they do not leap up to strike the casual and indifferent reader; that it is no great

^{*} Verse 15: "But God will redeem my soul from the power of Hades; for He will take me."

² Verse 10: "He *must* see it. Even wise men must die. The fool and the brutish person shall perish together, and leave their wealth to others."

marvel if, as a rule, the Jews did not find in the Psalm a clear and manifest assurance of a life to come; and that, after all, it is a little doubtful whether we should have found so much in it if we had not first studied in the school of Christ.

But there is one lesson in it which even the most cursory reader need not miss; viz., the vanity of mere wealth—a lesson which, to their credit be it said, the Jews of many generations did learn from this and other Scriptures, although of all races they seem to have most completely forgotten it now. For something like a thousand years—say, from about B.C. 500 to A.D. 500—the Jews did value a good man, a man who kept the Law, far above a rich man; and a man whom they held to be wise as well as good, a man who could teach the Law, far above the kings and princes of the earth—venerating their rabbis, however poor they might be, and they were often very poor, as the greatest and best and happiest of men.

The whole Psalm pours contempt on wealth, pursues it with the most incisive and biting irony. Its pictures of the man who devotes his whole life to amassing a treasure of which, when he takes the inevitable journey of death, he cannot carry so much as a single shekel with him; of the man who calls his lands after his own name, as if to cheat death itself and to secure a bastard immortality, perpetuating his name on earth while he himself perishes in Hades; and of the man who thinks it possible to bribe Death, and buy the power "to live on for ever," are quick with a scorn beyond that of satire. They tremble with a fervid moral indignation and contempt for the folly which can mistake wealth for man's chief good. Wealth is

not man's chief good: it is wrong and wicked, it is a profound and fatal violation of the Divine law and order, to make it the governing and supreme aim of life. For all who do that, even though they violate no human law, and even though they acquire but little of the wealth they seek, the Psalmist cherishes a pure unutterable scorn. To him they are losing the very form and status of men. They are flinging away their Divine birthright for a mess of pottage. They are sinking to the level of "the beasts that perish" (Verses 10, 12, 14, 20, by their repetitions, shew how strongly this thought had seized the Poet's mind); i.e. they are living as if they had no life but this, as if death were not, as if there were no land of light beyond the grave.

But there is one picture of them, still hidden from us by a thin veil of words, in which his scorn for these brutish persons culminates in a figure as terrible, perhaps, as any in the whole range of Scripture. In Verse 14 he depicts them as "the sheep of death." The opening clauses of the Verse, rightly translated, run: "Like sheep they are gathered to Hades; Death is their Shepherd" (he who feeds or finds pasture for them; not he who "feeds on them"). What the Psalmist means is, that men who make wealth their ruling aim are not simply like the beasts that perish, but are in very deed the Sheep of Death; that it is Death whom they have chosen for their Shepherd, instead of God, the Author and Source of life; that it is Death who finds pasture for them while they live, and who, when they die, drives them to his fold in the unseen world. Think of it! The Sheep of Deathmen following that grim Shadow to the darkness in

which it dwells! and these the men who "bless their souls" (Verse 18), whom the world praises because they have done good to themselves, whose "sayings" the world quotes and approves after they have gone to their long dark home!

Was there ever a more grisly and dreadful metaphor? And yet is it one whit too dreadful? Is it not true that every man who trusts in riches, or longs for them, as his chief good, is pursuing death, not life, has taken for his shepherd "the dark Shadow feared of man," although he knows it not? Can we not see in that very trust or longing the very brand of Death, the private and distinctive mark of that grim Shepherd?

Man was not made to find the chief good and market of his time in gain, in growing rich, in founding families and calling lands after his own name. And any man who puts that first which God did not mean to be first, so far forfeits his life, so far comes under the dominion of death: for what is death save the subversion of the true order of life? We truly live only as we fulfil the law of our being, as we live for what God meant us to live, and as He meant us to live. So far as we fall short of that, God ceases to be our Shepherd; and of our own will and choice we become the Sheep of Death.

Or take the same thought in another form. Whatever is perishable falls under the power, stands within the province, of Death. Before it perishes, and so long as we have regard to its true uses, we may make it serve us in many ways, as the living tree draws nourishment from the fading leaf. But if we plunge our very souls into it, if we love it supremely, and pursue it more eagerly than aught beside; if, in a

word, we *live* in the perishable, what are we to do when it perishes? We have lost our chief good, our chief aim; we have lost our very life. And if a living immortal man *will* set his affections, attach his best and highest interests, to that which he cannot take with him for more than a single brief stage of his long journey, what should brand him as a sheep of death if not that he has deliberately attached himself to the perishable and transient elements of a transient and perishable world, and made no provision for the world beyond the grave? When Death comes to *him*, he comes to his own. When Death drives him out of the world, where should he drive him save to his own fold?

The Sheep of Death! Who could not resent the name if it were applied to him? Go to any rich man rejoicing in his gains; tell him that on his stately mansion, his broad fields, his prosperous speculations, his accumulated treasures, there is hidden the fatal mark which proves him to be of the flock of Death; and, however wholly he may be living to himself, however little he may be doing for others, and though in comparison with wealth he despise wisdom, genius, righteousness, and would part with them all, if he had them. rather than lose his chief treasure, yet would he not be sincerely shocked, would he not indignantly resent the imputation, if at least he did not account you to be "the fool" which the Psalmist calls him? And yet, after all, what has he acquired, what is he living for. that will outlast death? what that he can carry beyond "the bourn"? To live in and for the perishable, is not that to perish?

Little or much, what does it matter? If a man could inherit or acquire the whole realm of nature, or

if he be content with a few houses and fields, or a few hundreds a year and what these will bring him, so long as he can be content to move within the limits of time and sense, and makes no provision for the spirit that is in him, or the eternity through which that spirit must endure, he is equally the bond-slave of Death. So long as he sows to the flesh, whether on a larger or a smaller scale, he can only reap the inevitable harvest of corruption. He is of those of whom it is written, "Like sheep they are gathered into Hades; for Death is their Shepherd."

BRIEF NOTICE.

It is well known among Hebrew scholars that for many years—years amounting to an ordinary lifetime—Dr. Franz Delitzsch, to whom we owe some of our best commentaries on Old Testament Scriptures, has been engaged on a translation of the New Testament into the Hibrew language. It is not so well known as it should be that this his cherished task is now all but completed, and has already taken visible form. A volume containing the whole New Testament. rendered into choice Hebrew, lies before us. Nor is even this the first edition of his work. In the first he took the Codex Sinaiticus for his text, altering and correcting it from the other most ancient and authoritative MSS. His translation from this text he offered to the British and Foreign Bible Society, which has long desired a good modern rendering of the New Testament Scriptures for distribution among Hebrew-reading Jews. But the Society, not very wisely, clings tenaciously to the Textus Receptus. Hence it declined a translation made from a better and more ancient text, although the excellence of the translation and the necessity for it were demonstrated by the fact that in three months a large first edition was sold out. Bent on achieving his purpose, resolved on getting a good translation of the New Testament widely distributed among the seed of Abraham, Dr. Delitzsch accommodated himself to the self-defeating prejudice of the Bible Society, and based his second edition on the Textus Receptus, correcting it, however, between brackets, by the

more ancient authorities, thus bringing in by the back-door most of the readings which he had been compelled to expel by the front. In this form also the excellence of his translation, its immense superiority over previous attempts, was apparent, and another large edition was sold out in a few months. A third edition is now in the press, and will shortly be issued. Dr. Delitzsch invites, and is anxious to receive, suggestions as to any possible improvement, whether in text or translation—but especially the latter—from scholars of every nation and creed. He hopes to make his fourth the standard edition of this great work, and is bent on making it as nearly perfect as he can. And as he has undertaken it mainly with a view to benefit the people to whom the oracles of God originally pertained, and has generously presented the fruit of his long toil to the Society which has the best means for distributing it among them, he surely deserves the sympathy of all who love the truth as it is in Jesus, and the aid of as many as are in any way able to aid him. If among the writers or readers of THE EXPOSITOR there are any who have the will and the leisure to help him with the suggestions he invites, the EDITOR will be happy to transmit them to him.

INDEX.

The Dean of Peterborough.				141
Ecclesiastes.				PAGE
2. Chapter i. Verses 12–18			- ***	61
3. Chapter ii. Verses 1-3				165
4. Chapter ii. Verses 4-11			•••	313
Rev. R. E. Bartlett, M.A.				
Abraham Justified by Faith				216
Rev. Joseph Agar Beet.				
Sanctified in the Wife			•••	321
Rev. A. B. Bruce, D.D.				
Zion the Spiritual Metropolis of the	e World		***	134
Israel's God her Glory	***	• • •	***	433
Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D.				
Studies in the Life of Christ.				
13. Jericho and Jerusalem				253
Rev. Canon Farrar, D.D.				
The Rhetoric of St. Paul	***	***	***	I
VOL. X. 32				

INDEX.

Rev. George Findlay, B.A.	
St. Paul's Use of θΡΙΑΜΒΕΥΩ	403
A Biblical Note. Colossians i. 3–5	74
Professor John Massie, M.A.	
A Word Study in the New Testament. Part III.	48
Rev. George Matheson, D.D.	
The Paradox of Christian Ethics	81
Christianity and Judaism	275
Rev. James Morison, D.D.	
The Christology of St. Paul, in the Superscription	of his
Epistle to the Romans	149
Niger.	
God Wrestling with Man, and Man with God	241
Immanuel	331
The Sheep of Death	466
Rev. J. S. Purton, M.A.	
A Biblical Note. Galatians i. 19	162
Rev. H. R. Reynolds, D.D.	
The Second Epistle to Timothy.	
1. The Last Words of St. Paul	116
2. Chapter i	195
3. Chapter ii	291
4. Chapter iii	365
5. Chapter iv	443

Rev. P. Thomson, M.A.					PAGE
Nebuchadnezzar's Conquest of Eg	gypt. C	Confirm	ed from	ı a	
Contemporary Hieroglyphic Inscr	ription				397
T 414					
Editor.					
VI. The Soliloquy of Job. Se		_			27
VII. The Intervention of Elihu			***		99
24. First Discourse	***	***			173
25. Second Discourse	***				341
The Praise of Love			***		386
Hosea's Children			***		422
	(D:	r Vanc	e Smith)	
Additional Note on Romans ix.	5 Di	r. Sanda	ay	1	232
	(Ca	inon Fa	ırrar)	
Brief Notices.					
Thomas Herbert's Realistic Assump	ptions o	f Mode	ern Scie	nce	
Examined	***	***			238
Canon Farrar's Life and Work of St	. Paul				389
Bishop Ellicott's New Testament.	Vol. III	[.	***		391
Studies on the Times of Abraham		***	***		392
Cambridge Bible for Schools.					
Lias on 2 Corinthians					393
Rawson Lumby on Acts of the					393
Plumptre on St. Peter and St. J					394
Abbott's Illustrated Commentary of	New T	estamer	nt		394
Bible Readers' Commentary					395
Dr. Schaff's Through Bible Lands					396
Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament					475

INDEX OF SCRIPTURES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xxxii. 24-28	241	Hosea i. 4, 6, 8–10	422
Job xxxi	27	ii. I, 2I, 22.	422
xxxii. 1-6	113	Romans i. 3, 4	149
xxxii. 6—xxxiii. 33	173	ix. 5	232
xxxiv	341	1 Corinthians vii. 14	321
Psalm xlix	466	2 Corinthians ii. 14	403
lxxxvii	134	Galatians i. 19	162
Ecclesiastes i. 12-18	61	vi. 1-5	81
ii. 1-3	165	Colossians i. 3-5	74
ii. 4-11	313	ii. 15	403
Solomon's Song viii. 6, 7	386	Hebrews i. 1, 2	275
Isaiah vii. 14	331	2 Timothy i. 1–18	195
lx. 19	433	ii. 1-26	291
Jeremiah xliii	397	iii. 1-16	365
xliv. 29, 30	397	iv. 1-22	443
Ezekiel xxix	397	*	
xxx	397		